

OCT 27



Concordia Theological Monthly



N O V E M B E R . 1 9 5 3

Concordia Theological Monthly

Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
the Managing Editor, F. E. Mayer, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, ALFRED O. FUEBRINGER,
FREDERICK E. MAYER, ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN,
WALTER R. ROEHRS, LEWIS W. SPITZ

CONTENTS

FOR NOVEMBER 1953

	PAGE
THE FACULTY AT BETHEL ON THE "DEMYTHOLOGIZING"	
CHAMPIONED BY PROFESSOR DR. BULTMANN	785
TEXTUAL-CRITICAL METHODS OF R. S. V. REVISION COMMITTEE	
(With Special Reference to the Pauline Epistles)	
E. George Krause	809
HOMILETICS	831
BRIEF STUDIES	845
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	854
BOOK REVIEW	867

Cox, G. E. P.: The Gospel According to St. Matthew. — Mülhaupt, Erwin (ed.): Dr. Martin Luthers Evangelienauslegung. — Orr, James: Revelation and Inspiration. — Brunner, Emil: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. — Murray, John: Divorce. — Brunner, Peter: Das Lutherische Bekenntnis in der Union. — Growing in Christ. An Exposition of Luther's Small Catechism. — Doniger, Simon: Sex and Religion Today. — Bays, Bertie Cole: Some Preachers Do. — Smith, Rockwell C.: Rural Church Administration. — Pleubner, Willard A.: More Power for Your Church. — Blackwood, Andrew W.: Expository Preaching for Today. — King, Julius: Successful Fund-Raising Sermons.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

C

Vo

T

"T

by

Dr.

app

issu

cler

is h

grac

Eng

auth

sugg

T

cha

furn

que

In

opin

T

man

be r

ing

Bult

lem

In

prec

sum

opin

reper

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXIV

NOVEMBER, 1953

No. 11

The Faculty at Bethel on the "Demythologizing" Championed by Professor Dr. Bultmann

Introductory Note.—The discussion of "Demythologizing," advocated by Dr. R. Bultmann, goes on apace. A highly significant evaluation of his position appeared when the faculty of the Bethel Theological School (near Bielefeld) issued an opinion (*Gutachten*) on this subject. To make it possible for our clergy to inform itself on the chief items pertaining to the debate, this opinion is here submitted in an English translation prepared by the undersigned. The gracious permission of the Bethel theological faculty for the publication of this English version of the document is gratefully acknowledged. In addition the authors through a committee examined this translation and offered valuable suggestions. For this, too, we here express our thanks. — WILLIAM F. ARNDT.

THE officials of the Evangelical Church of Westphalia approached the faculty of the Bethel Theological School with the request to submit an opinion on the "demythologizing" championed by Professor Bultmann which would be suitable to furnish parish pastors clarification and direction in this important question.

In joint endeavors we have made the attempt to formulate this opinion.

The intention is not to pass judgment on the theology of R. Bultmann in general. To do that, a far more detailed discussion would be required, for which we do not have the space here. In concerning ourselves specifically with demythologizing as understood by Bultmann, we had to curtail to some extent the study of the problem and thus simplify some of the implications.

In order to view the thoughts of Bultmann as objectively and precisely as possible, we have prefaced our opinion with a brief summary of the demythologizing process. Several times in the opinion proper we shall have occasion to refer to this by way of repetition, abbreviation, or further elaboration.

What has been elaborated is not intended to make superfluous a person's own independent study of Bultmann and the examination of our theses; hence we submit references to the pertinent literature in this area.¹

The questions that arise are of such great importance that no one who is a teacher of the Church can be excused from occupying himself personally with the problem. We are far removed from the idea of furnishing a finished and forever valid recipe which can be accepted without further examination.

The fact that this opinion is signed by all teachers of our theological school does not mean that among ourselves there are not at some points differences pertaining to the understanding, viewing, and emphasizing of certain matters. We also are of the opinion that this declaration, duly limited as it is, puts upon ourselves, according to the divine Word, the obligation constantly to examine anew the positions here taken. But this consideration did not keep us from issuing this treatise as our joint opinion.

A. BRIEF PRESENTATION OF BULTMANN'S DEMYTHOLOGIZING PROGRAM

Bultmann² affirms that the Gospel in its Biblical form very largely has no appeal for the man of our age. He holds this can-

¹ *Kerygma und Mythos*, published by H. W. Bartsch and containing R. Bultmann's essay on "Demythologizing" and the contributions of Schniewind, Lohmeyer, Thielicke, a. o., 2d ed., 1951. — K. Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, Vol. III, 2, p. 531 ff. — G. Bornkamm, "Mythos und Evangelium," in *Theo. Existenz heute*, Nr. 26, 1951. — O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit*, 2d ed., 1948 (translated by Filson with the title *Christ and Time*, Westminster Press, 1950). — Denkschrift der Evan. Theol. Fakultät der Universität Tübingen: "Fuer und wider die Theologie Bultmanns," *Sammlung gemeinverstaendlicher Vortraege*, Nr. 198/199, 1952. — H. Frey, *Das Wort ward Fleisch*, 1952. — W. Klass, "Der moderne Mensch in der Theologie Bultmanns," in *Theolog. Studien*, Part 24. — W. G. Kuemmel, "Mythische Rede und Heilsgeschehen im Neuen Testament," in *Coniectanea neotestamentica*, 11, 1947, p. 109 ff. — The same, "Mythos im Neuen Testament," in *Theol. Zeitschrift*, Part 6, 1950, p. 331 ff. — W. Kuenneth, *Theologie der Auferstehung*, 1951, 4th ed. — F. K. Schumann, *Wort und Wirklichkeit*, 1951. — E. Steinbach, *Mythos und Geschichte*, 1951. — H. Vogel, "Kerygma und Mythos," in *Schriftenreihe der Bekennenden Kirche*, Part 10, 1951/52. — W. Wiesner, "Anthropologische oder theologische Schriftauslegung," in *Evang. Theologie*, 1950/51, p. 49 ff.

² The writings of Bultmann which are referred to in the following are: "Die Entmythologisierung der neutestamentlichen Verkuendigung als Aufgabe," in *Kerygma und Mythos*, 1948, pp. 15—53; here cited as E. — "Zu J. Schniewinds, *Thesen, das Problem der Entmythologisierung betreffend*," in *Kerygma und*

not be attributed solely to the truth that for the unbeliever the Gospel message is necessarily an offense. The explanation, he thinks, is rather in part to be sought in this, that the world view has, since the days of early Christianity, undergone a fundamental change and that this change adds materially to the difficulties obstructing the acceptance of the Gospel. But here, so he thinks, the pulpit and professional theology do not occupy positions which cannot be surrendered, but rather owe it to modern man to remove these hindrances so that he may have free access to the Christian message (E., p. 16).

The "demythologizing of the New Testament proclamation" hence is conceived of as an endeavor which desires to make it easier for modern man to have real contact with the unabridged Gospel, in which he will learn to view himself and the world in a new light, having its source in God's plan of salvation.

While the antipathy of modern man to the Biblical world of thought is the occasion of Bultmann's endeavor, it is not to be the basis of his method, as if, for instance, the offensive character of a N. T. statement were to be the criterion for determining whether or not we should adhere to it and, if so, in what sense (E., p. 22). Bultmann definitely says that he does not wish to destroy, but to establish "the paradox of the presence of the distant God in history" (E., p. 53). But he thinks that the nature of the *mythos* itself, "which represents that which is nonworldly and divine as worldly and human, and that which is otherworldly as this-worldly," which, e. g., describes "God's otherworldliness as a matter of distance in space," contains the challenge for us to "demythologize." In this way only, so he alleges, can modern man be brought face to face with the real offense; for the actual meaning of the *mythos*, according to Bultmann, is not to give a world view which is objectively true, but rather to state how man considers his own existence in this world. It is necessary, then, to inquire what the real intention of the *mythos* is, that is, it has to be given an existential interpretation (E., p. 23). That all this applies also to the

Mythos, 1948, pp. 135—153; here cited as E. — *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, 1949; here cited as U. — Review of the book of E. Hirsch: *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte und der christliche Glaube*, in *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1940, col. 242 ff.; here cited as ThLZ.

mythological presentations of the N.T. is, so Bultmann thinks, clear, not only from the often recurring inconsistencies between the various *mythologumena* (for instance, the death of Christ is viewed as sacrifice and as a cosmic event, Christ is spoken of as the Messiah and as the Second Adam, as pre-existent and as expected Helper, as being born of a virgin and yet existing from eternity, etc. E., p. 24), but above everything else, in the circumstance that in the N.T. itself a certain demythologizing is already in progress. Thus statements about the future found in Jewish apocalyptic (for instance, about Judgment, eternal life) are regarded in John's Gospel, especially in ch. 5, as referring to something that happens now; and thus the "Spirit," popularly viewed as a magical physical force, is in reality considered by Paul "as the possibility of truly living, opened up through faith" (E., p. 31, 33).

From all this follows for Bultmann the necessity of giving an existential interpretation to the *mythos*—a conscious departure from the procedure of the former liberal theology which got rid of the *mythos* by simply eliminating it.

This interpretation of Bultmann, because it is undertaken with the modern man in view, makes use of Heidegger's conceptual theories, without, however, adopting his "solution." To begin with, Bultmann interprets the Christian conception of *existence* in "non-mythological" fashion. Here existence without faith is regarded by him as a condition subject to decay and death, because belonging to the sphere of what is visible, extant, disposable (*sarx*), manifesting itself in worry, search for security, boasting—things out of which arise envy, anger, and jealousy, but likewise treaties, agreements, and customs, without, however, conquering "fear" (*Angst*), which ultimately lurks behind everything (E., p. 28 ff.). In contrast to this, the man of faith, the believer, subsists on what is invisible, unknown, not disposable. He is free of the past, wide open to the future, in his "*eschatological*" *existence* altogether dedicated to God (E., p. 30 ff.).

When the question is asked how a person passes from the condition of unbelief to that of faith, Bultmann departs from Heidegger and other philosophers. Man's knowledge of his *own real condition*, available to him through philosophic insight into his existence, does not rescue him from his state of decay; "what he

knows about his own real self is made ineffective (*verfaelscht*) because it is combined with the opinion that he is master of *his real self*" (E., p. 39). From this point of view man's condition of decay appears as presumptuousness, i.e., as sin; for presumptuousness is ingratitude and hence guilt. Now, man, who is guilty, experiences God's forgiveness as an act liberating him from himself through the fact of Christ, has freedom from sin to become obedient. According to Bultmann, the fact of Christ, too, is pictured in the N. T. as a mythological event. But its connection with the historical Jesus already is nonmythological. The mythological account is merely intended to bring out the significance of Jesus as Savior and of His career as a saving event. This is the meaning of the pre-existence and of the birth of a virgin ascribed to Him. The crucifixion in mythological presentation is described as an atoning sacrifice, but its real non-mythological significance becomes evident in the N. T. itself even in this, that aside from atoning for sins — both those of the past and those of the future — Jesus' death on the cross has this result, "that the believer has been freed from sin as the power that rules him, from the service of sin." That is the meaning of those statements which raise the cross beyond and above the level of expiatory value and give it a significance of cosmic dimensions: that Christ has disarmed principalities and powers and made a show of them openly (Col. 2:13-15; E., p. 45 f.). As an event which both judged and freed the world this historical event "for us" gets to have a saving value with cosmic significance; "for us," living many centuries later, it gets to be something contemporaneous (E., p. 46 f.).

The cross, of course, has this significance for us only as the cross of Him who is risen from the dead. But the resurrection is nothing else than something that expresses the soteriological meaning of the cross. The death of Christ by itself is victory over the power of death. The resurrection is not added as a second factor, as an attesting miracle. Rather it as well as the cross is an "eschatological" event, i.e., it must be laid hold of by us in our lives.

But how does a person arrive at faith in the saving significance of the cross? In no other way than this, that it — together with the resurrection — is preached and by its appeal reveals to us the possibility of the new understanding of ourselves. That which has to

be joined to the cross and hence make it intelligible as a saving event is not the resurrection (as attesting miracle), but the proclamation! Through it the cross and the resurrection become something contemporaneous, and the "eschatological now" gets to be a reality (E., p. 48 ff.).

If one believes that in the historical events constituting Jesus' life and death God's work of salvation was accomplished — and Bultmann contends this has to be our belief — then there remains, as he says, something mythological for the person who will "call even this mythology that we speak of God as *acting*, i.e., of His decisive eschatological activity." But in this case mythology no longer is identical with what disappeared through the discarding of the mythological view of the world. Here, rather, one is confronted with the actual paradox of the N. T. proclamation, that is, "that God's eschatological Messenger is a concrete historical human being, that God's eschatological operation is accomplished in what befalls a man, that hence it is an event which to the world cannot be proved to be eschatological" (E., p. 52).

B. THEOLOGICAL OPINION

Before we endeavor to express an opinion on this "demythologizing program," a few preliminary remarks have to be made.

1. Our aim in this discussion is not to pass judgment on the personal Christianity of Professor Bultmann. His repeated declaration that he desires to have the unique soteriological significance of Jesus Christ preached to modern man in such a way that it can be understood must be acknowledged and form a presupposition in this discussion. The question is rather how today the saving significance of Jesus must be preached in the Church and through the Church to the world. Of course, with the question "how?" is closely joined the question "what?" In this sense the theological thinking which has resulted in the demand for "demythologizing" in a high degree concerns every preacher, pastor, and teacher in the Church.

2. Not theology and theological thinking founded and maintained the Church, but this is done solely by the living Lord through the work of the Holy Spirit, who faithfully adheres to His Word. Hence nobody need fear a theological discussion, not even if it extends to the questions lying at the very center of our Christian

faith. On the other hand, however, theological thinking can become a peril to the Church if it obscures, distorts, or even destroys the center of our faith and thereby gives support to an erring message and to erring religious convictions. Hence the discussion which now follows is necessarily accompanied by concern about the future of the Church of Jesus Christ on this earth. The observation that the Church in spite of theological debates, and also without attention to them, has existed, and the conviction that it will continue to exist, must not keep us from viewing clearly the peril of the theological thinking just mentioned.

It is the duty of theology ever anew in critical fashion to ask the question whether the proclamation of the Church properly gives expression to the great deeds of God which have founded and maintained it. Since this truth gives direction to the task of theology, this task does not consist in an exchange of opinions which are all equally true or equally false, but with respect to the truth mentioned it must distinguish between what is "nearer" and what is "more distant," between what tends "toward it" and what tends "away from it"; indeed, it must be daring enough to say what is "true" and what is "false," what must be followed and what not. But since theology does not *per se* have the truth at its disposal, there has to be room in the Church for thorough and honest theological discussions. They cannot be silenced by majority vote or by the obligation of the leadership of the Church to adhere to the Church's Confession. In this matter all are jointly responsible to the Lord of the Church, and what is required is honest work, careful observation, and argumentation pro and con. This self-denying labor is as much a part of the Church's life as are the liturgy and the charity endeavors.

3. But before we concern ourselves with the demand that a demythologizing process be introduced, the real question at issue must be definitely stated. The salient point would not be touched if, on the one hand, one should say with a note of approval: Bultmann in fully justified manner gives attention to the hermeneutical problem how the Gospel must be preached to modern man; and if, on the other hand, with a note of censure one should say: At the same time Bultmann makes modern man with the latter's capacity of comprehension the norm of Gospel preaching (cf. A above). The

question at issue reads: Is it really possible to present in non-mythological form the full content of the "Word of the Cross" both as an offense and as a saving message? Bultmann says this is not only possible, it is even necessary.

According to Bultmann, we need merely continue along the lines of demythologizing which in initial form are to be observed in the N. T. proclamation, in order to arrive at the presentation of what is really aimed at in this proclamation. We ask: Does this "interpretation of the N. T. *mythos*, calculated to be in keeping with man's understanding of existence," really bring before us the true sense of the original Christian message, or is the message thereby made obscure, empty, and is it destroyed? The theological work of Bultmann requires that this question be given a clear answer.

It is significant that the hermeneutical problem is again given consideration, but the demand for a clear and theologically well-founded hermeneutical method with respect to the N. T. must not be separated from the manner of applying it. What we are concerned with in Bultmann's case is not the right to demand such a hermeneutical procedure, but the "how?" of its application. At this point we are face to face with the new idea which requires discussion.

4. In coming to grips with the real question at issue we must not overlook the fact that what, according to Bultmann, the *Mythos* expresses about man's existence in a remarkable degree agrees with what is taught by the existential philosophy of today. In his theological studies, and not through his own life experiences, Bultmann, when analyzing the meaning of existence, which he thought he found in the N. T., came upon the words and concepts of existential philosophy and with amazement became aware of what he had not at all expected — the high degree in which philosophy, too, can arrive at an understanding of truth (cf. p. 788; E., p. 35). Rejecting the "solution" of existential philosophy, though he to a large extent operates with its concepts, he thinks that at the decisive point he draws a sharp line of demarcation between it and himself (E., p. 38). As he proceeds on his way, the question, of course, arises whether at the just-mentioned decisive point a separation is still possible after such a long distance has been traversed jointly.

Furthermore, Bultmann says that for modern man it is "senseless and impossible" to repristinate the mythological cosmology of the N. T. with its three stories (Stockwerke). The scientific picture of the world, which man today cannot refuse to accept, is, so Bultmann thinks, evidently the causal-mechanical. According to the latest physics, even this view of the world is being questioned. Causal-mechanical categories no longer are adequate for describing the universe. For the modern physicist, for whom matter has become an ever active, mighty energy, for whom causal chains represent merely what has come to exist, not the mystery of coming into existence, for whom this coming into existence belongs to the categories of warfare, decision, insisting, yielding—for such a man, let it be said in all seriousness, a mythological picture of the world may contain more truth than one that is causal-mechanical. Thus the hermeneutical problem has taken on a different face. In the following, too, this problematical aspect of things casts its shadows. But since the theological questions which Bultmann raises are independent of these changes in the conception of the nature of the universe, they, for the first, are disregarded in order that the chief issue may not be obscured.

I. BULTMANN'S VIEW OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

Beginning now to formulate our opinion, we state a point in which we fully agree with Bultmann: Jesus Christ comes to us in no other way than through proclamation (*die Verkündigung*). The proclaimed Word belongs to the work of Christ (E., p. 52; ThLZ., col. 245). There is no road bringing one to faith which by-passes the proclaimed Word. Not historical research, no discovery of certain facts or sources, can produce faith, only hearing the Word can do it. How has this Word to be proclaimed today? What is its relation to the historical account of Jesus? Precisely as we start from this given basis, our discussion with Bultmann gets to be necessary and meaningful.

1. It may surprise a person, Bultmann's theological presuppositions being what they are, that we in this connection speak of a historical view. He maintains that just this is the strong point in his position, that his interpretation of the primitive Christian proclamation is independent of the actual history of primitive Chris-

tianity and of the never fully conclusive results of historical research. It must be remembered that the "myths" of the N. T. (virgin birth, miracle stories, death of Jesus as expiatory, resurrection, ascension, return), according to Bultmann's opinion, are not intended to represent historical events. He holds that the Christian truth of the "myths" consists in this, that they express what the fact of Christ signifies for the believer's understanding of existence. That these events are soteriological, he avers, comes about solely through the fact that they are spoken about, the history of Jesus itself being without significance.

2. But now it can clearly be seen that Bultmann's demand to demythologize the N. T. cannot be separated from the conception which he thinks he has to entertain as to the historical origin of Christianity. Indeed, it is only in the light of this conception that his demand becomes fully intelligible. In the theological work of Bultmann we are furnished a classical example showing that a systematic general conception of the primitive Christian message and historical study and understanding are always joined. The former gives direction to the historical research and inquiry, the latter supplies the general conception with new evidence and new material. How is it possible for Bultmann to maintain that just through the right interpretation of the "myths" in the N. T. the actual soteriological events are presented? Because it is his opinion that what they report has never happened. He holds that from the very beginning they have never been but an expression of faith. What has actually happened is, so he holds, hardly any longer ascertainable for us; Jesus Himself is to us a great unknown. We can just barely perceive that He radically increased the severity of God's demands, that He insisted on decision, proclaimed the God who is near and likewise far, and died on the cross. Bultmann holds there were no miracles authenticating what he said and did. This apparently insignificant career the disciples, so Bultmann avers, rightly understood to be *the eschatological* world-changing, saving event; and to this their understanding they gave expression through mythological matters of various origins (taken from Jewish Apocalyptic, Hellenism, and Gnosticism). According to Bultmann, all these elements became accretions of the story of Jesus, molded certain

parts of the message of Christ, and united in smaller and in larger units, and finally jointly formed our Gospel. If this conception of the origin of the "synoptic tradition" is adopted, there easily results the demand that demythologizing be instituted. The "myths," it is asserted, were misunderstood and regarded as if it had been their aim to report actual historical events. Such an understanding of them, according to Bultmann, removes the particular feature of Christ which places Him beyond the realm of ordinary proof (*die Unausgewiesenheit des Christus*). In that case, says Bultmann, one can readily see that Jesus was actually the Christ, and the offense of the cross in its radical definiteness is gotten rid of; faith is looking for support and by that very token ceases to be faith. Hence he holds that we have to go back to the real offense caused by the poverty and the undemonstrable nature (*Unausgewiesenheit*) of Jesus; and this, he maintains, is accomplished when we interpret the *mythos* properly, that is, when we demythologize the N. T.

3. Now, does this view of the origin and development of the synthetic tradition really do justice to the phenomenon which we call primitive Christianity? Did the fundamental witness of primitive Christianity really grow and coalesce out of the religious conceptions of the world about it? Is it a "syncretistic religion" which, of course — as Bultmann, too, definitely admits (U., p. 198 ff.) — at decisive points significantly diverges from the world about it?

Bultmann's view of history can indeed well explain the agreement with the surrounding world, but from where do the surprising differences come? To put it differently: How is it to be explained that early Christianity knew it was irrevocably separated from Judaism? Or, again, how is it to be explained that in the world of Hellenism, which, generally speaking, was known for its tolerance and its fusing of religious ideas, primitive Christianity did not get to be one of the many religions peacefully existing there side by side, but felt its life and death depended on its remaining separate? That would be inexplicable if the young Church had itself created the content of its faith out of ideas existing in the world about it. Here Bultmann's construction of history meets difficulties. The witness of primitive Christianity makes us see clearly that the witnesses and the whole Church looked upon the

content of their testimony not merely as an expression of their faith, but as giving the foundation of their faith. They are not masters of this content, but they are bound to it because it has been received by them, and the witness of the Spirit confirms it ever anew. That Jesus Christ, being in the form of God, possessing divine riches, became poor and a servant, that He became obedient, loved, gave directives, suffered in weakness, instituted the Holy Supper with the explanatory words "for you," that He was crucified and rose from the dead on the third day, appeared to the witnesses, and now as "Lord" reigns in glory, acting through His messengers — these peculiar and remarkable events are for Paul and the congregations of his sphere of activity matters on which their faith is based and not mutable terms in which their faith finds expression. This can be stated in this way, too: Paul testifies to the personal Christ, and thereby indeed a light is kindled for the believer to understand his existence, but in this way only, that the personal Christ is the Center of the light. This, however, no longer plays a role in the scheme of Bultmann. But a view of primitive Christianity which does not do justice to these facts, yes, which in reality puts them upside down, is wrong at the very beginning.

4. Other details enter in which enable us to see the mystery of the N. T. still more definitely and which likewise lead to a different conception of early Christianity. In speaking of these matters, one must always remember that it is only through the proclaimed Word that faith is generated, not through historical research.

a. Without a doubt the primitive Christian tradition appeals to eyewitnesses (Luke 1:1-4). Even if a person should hold — an opinion which we do not consider justified — that nowhere in the N. T. do we hear the words of these eyewitnesses themselves, the question would have to be asked, how we are to conceive of this testimony of the eyewitnesses. They surely testified what they had seen and heard when they were with Jesus. Did they bear witness of the "poor" Jesus of Nazareth, unsupported by powerful deeds and miracles? Did these eyewitnesses not meet the risen Master? Did *they* fill the story of Jesus with mythological ideas? Or did those who first heard their message do it? And in that case, of course, only in this way, that the succeeding generation believed it was handing on the word of the eyewitnesses or that the eyewit-

nesses themselves gave sanction to the message of their successors which had in this manner been distorted and "enriched"? All these things are questions which, if Bultmann's view is adopted, cannot be solved. How much more clear and intelligible is the situation if we believe the testimony that in the message of the eyewitnesses there were included the very matters which we today call "mythological." In that case the message of later Christians is not a distortion, but may perhaps be called an unfolding. The picture of primitive Christianity given by Bultmann does not at all agree with the fact that the author of the third Gospel appeals to eyewitnesses and that he maintains that he has investigated everything carefully from the very beginning.

b. It is of great significance that the third Gospel and the Book of Acts were probably written by a man who lived near Paul; for in spite of a number of questions pertaining to details, it still is the most probable view that the person who wrote the "we" sections of Acts is the author of the third Gospel and the whole Book of Acts (cf. M. Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, 1952, p. 169 ff.). A man belonging to the circle about Paul undertakes to prove the "certainty of the Word" in which a Christian of the second generation was instructed, by telling the story of which these words testify. Hence Luke through living near Paul did not learn to be indifferent toward the details of the life of Jesus, but it is precisely he who gives careful attention to what has actually happened. Paul is not correctly interpreted if one understands him to entertain no interest in the historical Jesus. He does not belatedly project a *mythos* of Christ as Redeemer into the life of Jesus, but merely hands to others what he, too, has received.

c. Connected with this is the consideration that the words speaking of the poverty of Jesus and His being in the form of a servant must not be interpreted as if they indicated that the respective N. T. authors did not know the abundant tradition of the glory of Jesus in the days of His flesh. Passages like 2 Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:9-11. 1 Tim. 3:16, especially John 1:14, do not contradict the words of the lowliness of Jesus, but they rest on the statement that "Jesus was mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." John 1:14 is found in that Gospel which attests the "*doxa*" of Jesus more than any of the others. Hence these words do not con-

tain, in comparison, let us say, with Luke 1 and 2 and Matthew 1 and 2, with the miracle reports and the words of Jesus in which He claims Messiahship, a silent endeavor to demythologize, but it is only in connection with the whole tradition that they can be correctly understood. In this way only—as we shall endeavor to show—do they get to have their real meaning.

d. In speaking of the rise of the Gospel tradition, one must not only be concerned to show how the Gospels gradually coalesced out of various separate units, but likewise to understand the real impelling motive which brought about the forming, handing on, and collecting of these units. This impelling motive was the following: Whoever desired to give a correct testimony of Jesus to his contemporaries and to the Church had to testify to something that had happened. He had to appeal to the story of Jesus to show that the message of the Christ was well founded. Without the events pertaining to Jesus the witness would have been empty. This aim in the formation of the Gospels makes it impossible to hold that indeed the historicity of the events mentioned has to be sacrificed, but that the message nevertheless will retain its significance. Whoever bases his interpretation on this presupposition does not through his interpretation set forth the meaning of the primitive Christian testimony, but says something altogether different from what the old witnesses had in mind.

Here, of course, we must not lose sight of it that when the witnesses appealed to the story of Jesus, this very appeal constituted a testimony of Christ addressed to their own contemporaries. They do not appeal to a mere list of events, but to a story which is effective in their own time and which continues. While proclaiming Christ as present then and there, they set forth history pertaining to the life of Jesus. It is one of the mysteries of the N. T. that the testimony of the present Lord does not put into the background the memory of the life of Jesus. Both are inseparably joined together. This feature makes the Christian witness rich and varied. In the freedom of the spirit every witness gives new expression to his witness. But that, in the last analysis, is not a problem of literary history of the N. T., but is due to the facts themselves. There is no science of the tradition as such which could disregard the content of the tradition.

II. HISTORY AND PROCLAMATION

1. For Bultmann, as the foregoing discussion has shown, the problem of what should be the relation between present-day preaching and the story of Jesus of long ago is rather simple. The story of Jesus still has for the proclamation of Christ only this one meaning—that it did take place (E., p. 148). The proclamation in reality does not bear witness to events of the life of Jesus, but brings to man illumination of his existence. He can accept it. In that case he ceases to be subject to decay and death, to what is visible and disposable, to worry, boasting, and anxiety (*Angst*) (E., p. 29 f.). He gets to be a person who lives on what is invisible, liberated from the past, open to the future, absolutely dedicated to God in this "eschatological" existence (E., p. 30 f.). Through this decision on his part when he was confronted with the proclamation he became a "believer."

This description of the relation between the story of Jesus and the proclamation of the Christ does not agree with what the primitive Christian witnesses had in mind. The proclamation is empty if it is not carried forward by, and filled with, events in the life of Jesus. Only if it has the support of these events does it become "reliable" and "true." It is just through this understanding of the connection between history and proclamation that many difficult questions arise which Bultmann seems to have solved as he proceeds from his basis, but which still require our consideration.

2. In the following we shall endeavor to group together the statements on which the primitive Christian testimony in all its forms rests. The number can be increased. And they do not all have the same significance, but a brief grouping is necessary, since everything depends on a comprehensive survey of these remarkable facts. Jesus knows that He was "sent," He "went out" into this world. He manifested His power over demonic forces; and here all His mighty deeds have this twofold aspect: they signify victory and help, a demonstration of power against the demon and mercy for the sufferer. These deeds manifested His glory, His Messianic dignity, that is, they, too, were a revelation, they manifested who and what God is. As His deeds, so His Word was marvelous. Directly or indirectly He voiced the claim to be the Christ, forgiving sins, called men to Himself, joined them to His person, calling

Himself "the Son of Man," and speaking of His coming in glory. And all this was done in *weakness* and *poverty*. He took upon Himself the Baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins; at every step He had to inquire about the will of the Father; His Word was rejected. He did not win the nation, though with powerful words He called men to Himself and healed sick people. He was condemned by the court of the nation to which He knew He had been sent. It was exactly on account of His Messianic claim that He was put to death. He did not defend Himself. He died on the cross. His *death* according to the witness of the Gospels is the beginning of *life*, His *defeat* the hour of *victory*, of perfect love, and the severest tensions (*Anfechtung*). Jesus Himself speaks of His suffering as something necessary, to which He joins the expression "for you." For the disciples of Jesus His death was a catastrophe. Having risen, He placed them in a new beginning. He taught them to view His death and resurrection as a unit, as based on Scripture, and to regard the wonderful story of which they had been eyewitnesses as the beginning of the last age, which was to be followed by a coming of their Lord in glory. The Gospels take on their peculiar nature through the juxtaposition of these individual statements. This simply makes them unique. Jesus is King and Servant. He manifests His glory, but He dies nevertheless; but He who dies conquers through His very death. He who in despair suffered and who actually died steps before His disciples as the living Lord. These features are all seen in one view by people who met Him who had risen. And, again, this comprehensive view is not a deep theological attempt of men to give an interpretation, but it is the effect and gift of Him who was risen. This meeting with Him who was risen is the Source of the primitive Christian tradition. On this fact the proclamation rests, from it the proclamation results; for He who is risen, who teaches how all these facts are connected and belong together, likewise is the One who sends out the disciples. This fact becomes effective in the proclamation.

3. Now the question arises whether Bultmann is not right, after all, when he maintains that through the above presentation the "offense of the cross" is removed and the true nature of faith is corrupted, because thereby the undemonstrable character of the Christ of God seems to have been eliminated. In Jesus' miracles His glory appeared, and faith is given a support, for it is shown

the deeds of Jesus. Is Bultmann in this situation not justified when he raises the charge that the signs of Jesus as such, for instance, the resurrection, if viewed as a historical fact, compelled people to believe? Not at all. Faith indeed has a support in the marvelous deeds of God, but the perception of such deeds does not cause faith. In this relation of history and proclamation, as we feel constrained to view it, the offense of the cross is not removed, but made very evident. Now it is clearly seen that He who is rich became poor; that He who could have experienced joy suffered the cross; that He who laid claim to the Messianic dignity and performed eschatological deeds died in helplessness and weakness and did not defend His dignity as the Christ. For Jews and Greeks these things are mutually exclusive. That both kinds of facts are reported together, that is the thing which constitutes the offense of the cross. The undemonstrable character of the authority of Jesus (*die Unausgewiesenheit der Vollmacht Jesu*) does not consist in this, that we know nothing or only very little of Him, but that facts are reported about Him which are mutually exclusive. In Bultmann's presentation the death of Jesus gets to be a tragic fate; it is only when it is combined with His claim to be the Christ and with His life as the Christ that it becomes an offense.

4. To have faith it is necessary that the Holy Spirit open one's eyes and one be led to see the glory *and* the weakness, the death *and* the resurrection, which combined in a unity to form the work of Christ. In the weakness the glory comes to perfection, the glory remains in the state of weakness. That is, of the N. T. "*pistis*," too, to use Bultmann's terms, we can speak only in "mythological" fashion. But in that case the mythological terminology has to be viewed as being necessitated by the facts, as one from which we cannot subtract, since in faith we are always concerned with the union (*Zusammengehörigkeit*) of things divine and things human, or rather with the union of God and man, of weakness and glory, and not with the idea that something divine is presented as something human. In the demythologizing endeavor faith in the final analysis is nothing but the decision to say yes with respect to the proclamation. But the proclamation, too, participates in the victory and the weakness of the Lord. It really is the continuation of His history (ThLZ. col.242). The act and the content of the proclamation remain weak. One can contradict it, for only as Word does it come

to us. But at the same time it is powerful, for it conquers and liberates the human heart; and him whom it has conquered it endows with the adoption into sonship and with love. The *kyrios* comes to be the Victor. He overcomes and presents gifts. Thus "*pistis*," too, involves indeed daring and decision in view of the weakness of the Word, but at the same time and in a far higher degree a being-conquered, a receiving, a state of security in Him who through mighty deeds and miracles and the resurrection proved that He is the Victor. The formula: In faith man comes to himself, comes to understand his real being, he gets to be open toward the future (E., p. 30 ff.), cannot reflect the real nature of the N.T. "*pistis*." This formula, too, signifies an emptying, a perversion of faith into its very opposite; for he who believes does not know himself, but he knows his personal Lord and through Him arrives at knowledge of himself.

5. The position which is outlined above apparently at one point is very weak, and that is something which requires special consideration. In Bultmann the proclamation was independent of the results of historical investigation pertaining to the Gospels; this investigation has lost its theological significance. But the historical endeavors with respect to the Gospels cannot be discarded in such a simple fashion. If the proclamation of the Church rests on facts, then it is theologically significant what historical research says about these facts. This relation causes anxiety because it brings many tensions and questions before us. It is true that the certainty of faith does not rest on historical research. But nevertheless the believer cannot be dispensed from asking the question What took place? if he has given his adherence to a message which has reported events to him. Whoever destroys this relation — tormenting and distressing though it may be in its details — does not take seriously the statement that "the Word was made flesh." Only in this constant mutual relationship the proclamation remains conscious of it that it is joined to an historical account, and historical research remains conscious of it that it has to do with facts which even today are still set forth as the basis of our salvation.

6. A further consideration, which has not yet been expressly mentioned, sums up in a way everything that has been stated. For Bultmann, too, the life of Jesus is an "eschatological" event. But

he states that this does not mean there will be a final section of history, pressing forward to a certain goal, but the life of Jesus is eschatological because it always in the life of individuals makes it possible for a person to turn away from the visible world and to dedicate himself absolutely to God. The *eschaton*, he holds, occurs every time a man through the proclamation gets to be a believer; in that way the *eschaton* becomes a matter of the present time (cf. p. 789); and this acceptance of faith in the moment of the proclamation is the eschatological now; the thought of an eschatology which includes a final period of this world's history and tends towards a certain goal is mythological (E., p. 145 ff.). When, for instance, the Gospel according to St. John emphasizes the eschatological now in the presence of the Christ and the acceptance of faith on the part of the hearers of His Word, it demythologizes, Bultmann holds, the eschatology speaking of the end of the world (E., p. 31 ff.). At this point, too, he says, we ought to follow the hint of the N. T.: the moment of the proclamation and the creation of faith in the hearers is the only *eschaton* which we have knowledge of, the eschatological "now."

These thoughts again signify an emptying and abridgment of the N. T. at a decisive juncture. In all Biblical books and in all forms of the *kerygma* there is found, corresponding to the eschatological "now" in the life of Jesus, in the presence of the Spirit, in the act of proclamation, an eschatological goal which has not yet come into view. One cannot be separated from the other. The eschatological now has its eschatological significance for this reason only, that it points to a final goal. Without this note and without realization of this last goal it does not signify a real cutting of the cycle of sin and death. The *eschaton* of the N. T. is not merely the object of our hope, for in Christ Jesus it is a present reality; but neither is it contracted and shriveled up to be a mere now, for the Christ will come as Victor for the whole world. It is an error to say that the N. T. "demythologizes" through its emphasis on the eschatological "now." Rather through putting the accent at one time on the now and at another on the future it attests solid facts resting on the events pertaining to Christ.

The elimination of a final eschatological period has extraordinarily profound results. For the witnesses of the N. T. the message of

the coming Lord always includes this idea: God does not abandon this earth; He will come as Conqueror just as He in Christ conquered disease, death, demons, and sin. These victories — inclusive of the resurrection of Jesus — are a promise and a sign for the coming victory over the whole world. They are all merely phenomena accompanying the message of the coming kingdom of God. From this point of view once more light is shed on the interest the Biblical witnesses felt in the factualness of the events. On this earth, in this visible sphere, saving events occurred. Just as on this earth there is found a history of misery, so also there is found on it a history of salvation, of true victories of God, which all point to His final victory. Whoever knows only the eschatological "now" no longer is able to give expression to this aspect of the Biblical proclamation. The victories of God get to be for him always invisible occurrences, the visible world, the creation of God, no longer possesses any promises for him.

With this something else is joined. In speaking of the eschatological "now," Bultmann is always concerned with the act of proclamation and the decision of the hearer. But the message of the N. T. is far too rich to be enclosed in these categories. It does not merely see many single eschatological factors which in ever new decisions are joined one to the other, but it sees one continuing history which is governed by the exalted Lord and tends toward its end and goal. In other words, the story of Christ does not aim merely at decisions of individuals, but at a new people of God which performs its pilgrimage through the catastrophes of the final age till the Lord appears, a people which in this pilgrimage is given food and drink in the Word and the Sacrament, which is united in its confession of the Lord, and which displays its peculiarities in prayer, praise, and loving service (*Diakonie*). According to the conceptual categories of Bultmann, the "*ekklesia*" of the N. T. can be spoken of only in "mythological" fashion. It is in his view an eschatological event, not a "historical" (*historisch*) event in the sense of being a mere fact of universal history in past time, it is "historical" (*geschichtlich*) in the sense that, being ever anew all-important and decisive for us, it is realized in the story of our lives today (E., p. 52). In contrast to this, according to our opinion, what is true of faith, of the proclaimed Word, and of Christ Him-

self, where we always find a union of powerlessness and power, of what is divine and what is human, is true of the Church, too. It represents not merely ever new occurrences, but likewise a definite continuity which is based on the faithfulness of God. Just as in other respects, so here, too, demythologizing would mean spiritualizing, and the essence of the Church could no longer be understood by means of the fitting analogy of the incarnation of the Word. It would find its meaning solely in the relation (*Verkehr*) of the individual to God, and no longer in the additional concept of the "*communio sanctorum*."

7. At various points of our discussion it has become evident that when a person eliminates the so-called mythological sections of the *kerygma*, the latter suffers important subtractions. Now there arises once more the unavoidable question whether Christ or, respectively, the events pertaining to Christ can be separated from the world view in which they have been encased in the N. T. proclamation, whether there can perhaps be elaborated a pure presentation of the saving events, not obscured by any additions resulting from a contemporaneous world view. It is part of the historicity of the Word that it with its incarnation likewise accepted the form of a world view current at a given time. But just as it always casts aside the fetters of its bodily (*fleischliche*) existence, so it, already in the N. T., always lays aside the world view with which it is joined through the incarnation (cf. p. 788). That circumstance contains for us the hint that while the saving events are for all time connected with a concrete view of the universe, this world view as such is not meant to have validity for us. World views change; the modern scientific one, too, cannot claim to possess finality.

Accordingly it will have to be an inalienable part of the proclamation to state that the world view underlying the message of the life of Christ was a contemporaneous one. But since Jesus Christ Himself is at work, the saving events are to such a degree a present reality that—as we see again and again—the hearer whose world view is different can be touched by the message without experiencing that the difference in world view is a barrier to his faith.

Thus, to give an example, in preaching about the ascension of Christ, the emphasis will have to be placed on this, that Christ now

no longer is with His disciples in a visible way, but is with the Father and invisibly has begun to rule the world—a truth which the N.T., its contemporaneous world view notwithstanding, is eager to teach us.

III. BIBLICAL HISTORY AND THE MYTHS OF THE NATIONS

The N. T. itself always employs the word *mythos* and the things it signifies in a derogatory sense (1 Tim. 1:4; 2 Tim. 4:4; Titus 1:14; and 2 Peter 1:16). Whatever view one may take of these passages as to details, it is clear that the witnesses, in the moment when early Christianity came in contact with the world of the *mythos*, felt that they were separated from this world. It is plain they wished to say that what they were offering was not something devised by themselves, something formed by human phantasy and profundity, but something that had occurred and which had been entrusted to them, of which they were not the masters. Now, it cannot be denied that what the N. T. attests as the story of Christ has some relations to the *mythos* of the nations in general. These relations pertain to form and content. For one thing, they pertain to form. The definition of the *mythos* that it, as it is put, presents divine matters as human (E., p. 26, n. 2) can be applied to every story in the life of Jesus, yes, in the final analysis, to the whole N. T. With respect to content, too, there are relations. The *mythos* of the nations dwells, among others, on three great themes: the subject of the dying God who rises again; of the Redeemer who is sent from the world of light into the world of matter to take men as children of light into the world above; and of the coming Ruler of peace who, begotten and born in a miraculous way, will inaugurate the golden age. The similarity with the story of Christ is patent. But the great difference is clear, too. The dying and rising god of the *mythos* represents a law of life. Just as this law of life repeats itself one year after the other, so a cultic ceremony repeats the dying and rising from death of the respective god in lamentations and orgiastic exultation. In the N. T. there is not the slightest trace of the repetition of Jesus' death and resurrection. On the contrary, both events have the characteristic of occurring once and of not being repeated. In the same way Jesus does not enter the world of matter in order to free men in the role of Redeemer from its power and to lead them to the realm of light. He enters the

world of estrangement from God, and as the Lamb of God He brings about freedom from guilt. Again, as promised Helper He does not usher in the golden age of the *mythos*, but He brings peace with God as a pledge of the final consummation. These are not merely a few differences alongside of many agreements, but these differences utterly contradict the ideas which form the soil that produced the pagan myths. These differences present everything else in a different light and demonstrate in the very similarity with the themes and the respective vocables and concepts that here there exists a contrast which is contradictory.

How is this situation to be explained? There is only *one* answer which does justice to the witness of the N. T.: it has pleased God to let the story of Christ in its special relation to the O. T. revelation take such a course that it from the beginning through its historical development has become the fulfillment also of the *mythos* of the nations. Just as He lets the history and the expectation of Israel reach its goal, so He "fulfills" the expectation of the nations. Here, of course, a significant difference must not be overlooked. Only if a person has the meaning of the Old Testament disclosed to him through the New and can see the story of Christ as fulfillment of the O. T., will he understand that the Christ of Israel likewise fulfills the promise given to Abraham with respect to all nations. The Servant of God, who dies in Israel, brings salvation to the "islands." He comes as the "Consolation of Israel" and as a "Light to lighten the Gentiles." But the story of Christ fulfills the *mythos* by at the same time striking it out, judging it, and destroying its validity. What was expected became — in relation to the expectation and yet altogether differently from what was expected — a one-time and never-to-be-repeated event. As this event occurs, it is at once made clear that it has significance for the nations, too, and that it can be proclaimed to them as salvation which they can lay hold of in repentance and faith, and in no other way.

C. CONCLUSION

As we mentioned above (cf. p. 700), Bultmann, at the end of his essay from which we have quoted, asks the question whether any "mythological remnant" is left (E., p. 52). If Bultmann thereby indicates his willingness to acknowledge the "paradox" of an acting

God (who must not be conceived of in philosophical categories as perhaps a quiescent *ens*, not as something undiscoverable, not as an all-pervading force of nature or a highest value, but as a rescuing, saving, personal God, seeking the well-being of men) without intending to have this terminology regarded as mythological, why, we ask, should this paradox not be extended to pertain to the *manner in which* He acts? If a person in all seriousness assumes that God acts — and that is something which Bultmann wishes to cling to (E., p. 43 and 52) — how can he prescribe to God how He has to act, and what He in that way may accomplish and what not? How can we dictate to Him a world view — and at that, one that is transitory — which fixes the limits beyond which He must not go because otherwise our world view would be interfered with?

It simply has pleased God to act and work on this earth in facts whose unrepeatable uniqueness consists in the indestructible union of what is human and what is divine, of weakness and of glory. Demythologizing cannot give us the intended significance. It changes the facts and destroys the things that are to be given attestation. Bultmann's interpretation against his wish gets to be elimination. In truth, there is no method which guarantees the right apprehension of the saving events. We are not masters of the content of the proclamation. We can merely pass on the witness which we have received. The herald makes his proclamation unprotected by any method; it is important that in preparing for the proclamation through employment of all philological and historical subsidiary means he remains ready to obtain from his unique message itself the categories for the right apprehension of the saving events. In this way only, considering himself an associate of all questioners and doubters to whom he has to preach keeping his ears open, awaiting the promised activity of the Holy Spirit, will he testify with assurance that the myths of the nations have long ago in the story of the Christ of the N. T. been demythologized by God Himself.

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF BETHEL

A. ADAM, W. BRANDT, J. FICHTNER, H. FREY, G. FRIEDRICH,
H. GIRGENSOHN, H. GREEVEN, H. KRAEMER, H. J. STOEBE,
H. H. WOLF

Bethel, Easter, 1952

Textual-Critical Methods of R. S. V. Revision Committee

(With Special Reference to the Pauline Epistles)

By E. GEORGE KRAUSE

EDITORIAL NOTE: The writer of this article was graduated from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, in June, 1952, receiving the B. A. degree. As a Graduate Fellow he pursued advanced studies from 1952 to 1953, earning his S. T. M. He is now pastor at Loves Park, Ill. Because of the current interest in the R. S. V. this careful study in one area of critical appraisal of the new version is deemed particularly timely by the editors.

CHAPTER I

PHENOMENON OF VARIANT READINGS

It is a well-known fact that the autographs of the writings constituting Scripture have been lost. The study of the *copies* of these autographs, made by a great variety of scribal hands in widely scattered areas of the ancient world, is involved and intriguing. Biblical scholarship has attempted to ascertain as closely as is humanly possible the form of those "God-breathed" autographs. This is a Herculean task, in addition to a painstaking and often tedious one, since the scribes who copied the inspired autographs or translations of the inspired originals allowed various alternative and sometimes widely divergent readings to enter the text. And since we have many, though most probably not nearly all of these copies, and since we can be quite sure that the originals are irretrievably lost, we have a problem. This problem is referred to in scholarly circles as "textual criticism." Since this problem must, of necessity, confront every assiduous and devout reviser and translator of Holy Scriptures, not to mention every honest student of the Greek New Testament, and since this problem has accordingly confronted also the revision committee of the Revised Standard Version, a brief orientation with regard to the textual-critical problem is in order before we can attempt to study the methods of the revisers and the conclusions arrived at by them.

In this study, then, we shall first review the problem of textual criticism, with its implications for the translator. In such a situation the reviser or translator must have certain criteria to guide

him. A brief glimpse at the criteria employed in the R. S. V. is our next step. The questions, then, arise: "What readings were used? How were these criteria applied?" Perhaps this would be the best place to mention that because of the tremendous wealth of material and the necessarily huge expenditure of time required by the careful examination of all these variant readings in the entire Pauline corpus, we have limited the scope of this study to Galatians and to the Captivity Letters (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon). We are of the opinion that, after having investigated the procedure employed by the revisers in these five Epistles, at least a pattern of sorts can be set down, demonstrating their employment of textual-critical criteria and the available manuscript evidence.

The vast complexity and seemingly inscrutable mass of manuscripts and their seemingly innumerable variant readings have been rendered much less chaotic by the spadework of such giants as Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Gregory and Streeter, to mention only a few. Prolonged and detailed study of available uncials and minuscules revealed that a number of them had a characteristic in common which distinguished them from the others. Westcott and Hort, who published an edition of the Greek New Testament in 1881, contemporaneously with the Revised Version,¹ propounded a theory of genealogy of manuscripts which, although often criticized, has become the basis, with some revisions and alterations, for our present-day theories regarding manuscript relationships and origins. Hence the terms "Neutral," "Alexandrian," "Caesarean," and "Western" are the stock in trade of every textual critic of the New Testament.

Dr. Frederick C. Grant states that the revisers agreed on a number of occasions with the readings of the text as proposed by Westcott and Hort.² In view of this statement, a brief résumé of Westcott and Hort's theory of genealogy is in order.

¹ Vol. I of Westcott & Hort's text was published May 12, 1881, the Revised Version, May 17, 1881, and Vol. II of Westcott & Hort's text, Sept. 4, 1881, according to a newly discovered letter of A. F. Hort, dated Dec. 3, 1905, addressed to Dr. Kenyon and now in the possession of Mr. Thomas T. Reuther, graduate student at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis.

² *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, by members of the Revision Committee, International Council of Religious Education (n. p., 1946), p. 41.

As Kenyon concisely states,³ the theory allowed for four main classes, or families, of texts, viz., the Western, the Alexandrian, the Syrian, and the Neutral. The Western class was characterized by a very free handling of the text and a very early (second century) departure from the true tradition. Being best known from its appearance in the Latin authorities, it was given the name "Western," and is represented by Codex Bezae, the Old Latin Version, and the Curetonian Syriac. In his graph of Westcott and Hort's theory, Streeter includes family Θ "so far as known."⁴ In a later portion of his book, however, he states that "The text of family Θ is slightly, but only slightly, nearer to the Western than to the Alexandrian type; also it has a large and clearly defined set of readings peculiar to itself."⁵ The *Alexandrian* class resulted from a sense of literary smoothness and a desire to plane away the rough "unliterary" edges. According to the graph in Streeter, the *Alexandrian* group was represented by Codices Ephraemi (C), and L, papyrus 33, and the Sahidic and Bohairic Versions.⁶ At about the middle of the fourth century an authoritative revision culminated in the *Syrian* type, which became the immediate forerunner and predecessor of the universally dominant Textus Receptus, as per the diagram in Streeter.⁷

Only a few manuscripts escaped the ancient revisers' hands, and to this minority group the term *Neutral* is given. These, according to Westcott and Hort, come closest to the pure tradition and are best represented by Codices B and \aleph (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, respectively). Such, in brief, is the theory which lay behind Westcott and Hort's edition of the Greek New Testament, which edition, together with Tischendorf's eighth major edition and Nestle's eighteenth edition, we have used in the preparation of this paper.

And, since Tischendorf's edition was used, it should be noted here that according to Robertson⁸ this edition is based pri-

³ Frederick G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (Oxford, 1933), pp. 6, 7.

⁴ H. B. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (Rev. 1930, 7th impression; London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 26.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ A. T. Robertson, *Introduction to Textual Criticism* (New York: Geo. H. Doran Co., 1925), p. 84.

marily on \aleph (Sinaiticus) and B (Vaticanus), but contains the readings of the Neutral class generally, which, as Robertson says elsewhere,⁹ included the Bohairic and the readings in Origen.

The seeming contradiction that, in identifying the Alexandrian group, we included the Bohairic Version and again, immediately above, included the Bohairic in the Neutral class, is resolved by Robertson himself, who states that "Nearly always this class [that is, the Alexandrian] appears with the Neutral or with the Western."¹⁰ Regardless of the class into which it is placed, however, the Bohairic is closely akin to \aleph and B, as Kenyon emphatically states.¹¹

It should also be mentioned in passing that, in addition to the four families of manuscripts designated by Westcott and Hort, a fifth, the so-called "Caesarean," is recognized by textual critics, which was necessitated by the discovery of the Koridethi Gospels (Θ). Origen's Gospel commentaries are the basis of this new nomenclature, since it is evident that in his Johannine commentary he used an Alexandrian type of manuscript, but in his *Commentary on Matthew* and in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom* he used a different type of text again. Since he moved to Caesarea A.D. 231, he obviously used for the last two works a text in use there, represented by the Θ type, hence the term "Caesarean."¹² Nestle, in his "Explanations for the Greek New Testament," includes in the Caesarean group the Koridethian Manuscript, "family 1" (minuscules 1, 118, 131, 209), "family 13" (13, 69, 124, 346, etc.), together with minuscules 565 and 700.¹³ Since this text type deals largely with the Gospels, it is of no great concern in this present study, but was mentioned here to round out the brief picture of manuscript genealogy.

Alterations, modifications, interpolations, versions, revisions, all together, pose the problem of deciding very carefully for a particular

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Frederick G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (new edition; London: Duckworth, 1949), p. 133.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

¹³ Eberhard Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (18th edition; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1948), p. 69*.

reading throughout the entire New Testament. The implications of all these variants for the translator and the criteria to be employed in translating are the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

EFFECTS OF VARIANT READINGS ON TRANSLATION

With all the often conflicting and frequently confusing witness of the various manuscript families and "subfamilies" at hand, what procedure did the Revision Committee of the R. S. V. follow?

Dr. Frederick C. Grant of the Revision Committee gives us a clue in the work hereinafter referred to simply as the *Introduction*:

With the best will in the world, the New Testament translator or reviser of today is forced to adopt the eclectic principle: each variant reading must be studied on its merits, and cannot be adopted or rejected by some rule of thumb, or by adherence to such a theory as that of the "Neutral" text. It is this eclectic principle that has guided us in the present Revision . . . and it is really extraordinary how often, with the fuller apparatus of variant readings at our disposal, and with the eclectic principle now more widely accepted, we have concurred in following Westcott and Hort.¹⁴

However, it must of necessity be borne in mind also that the role claimed for the R. S. V. by its supporters is that of a revision, and not a new translation. The International Council of Religious Education defined the task of the revisers as follows:

We, therefore, define the task of the American Bible Committee to be that of revision of the present American Standard Bible in the light of the results of modern scholarship, this revision to be designed for use in public and private worship, and to be in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version.¹⁵

Since the *American Standard Bible* here referred to is an offshoot and a very close relative of the Revised Version of 1885, a brief look at the aims of the 1885 revisers might be in place here. Price says:

According to the Preface of the Revised Version, some of the general principles which were agreed to on May 25, 1870, by the

¹⁴ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Revision Committee of Convocation for their guidance were: "(1) To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness; (2) to limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English versions. . . ." ¹⁶

Although these were worthy aims, the end result was far from satisfying. Consensus today is that the American Standard Version (A. S. V.) suffers from a too literal rendering of the Greek. To quote Price again:

But for whatever reason, the A. S. V. already lags behind the scholarship of the present. . . . The consistency of the translators also became a vice; it is a mechanical procedure and not true translation to follow rigidly chosen word equivalents. Words take on meaning from their context, so that an elasticity of rendering is demanded if the true sense is to be served.

Then, strange as it may sound, the American Standard Version was far too conservative; or more strictly, it was uneven in its attitude to the King James, changing when often the old was better and yet conforming its rendering as a whole to the form of seventeenth-century scholarship.¹⁷

Sherman E. Johnson, writing in the *Anglican Theological Review*, has this to say of the Greek text used in the preparation of the Revised Version: "The Greek text underlying the *Revised Standard Version* is better than that of the Revised Version, which was an uneasy compromise between the 'received text' (translated by the King James Version) and the readings of Westcott and Hort." ¹⁸

While the Westcott-Hort text played a major role in the formation of the R. S. V., this is not the whole story. The preference given to any particular reading in any given instance is, barring the inevitable and intangible human element, to be justified by the principles followed by the Revision Committee and enunciated by Dr. Grant in the *Introduction*:

¹⁶ Ira M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible* (13th printing, 2d rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949), p. 281.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

¹⁸ Sherman E. Johnson, "The Revised Standard Version," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXX (April, 1948), p. 83.

1. No one type of text is infallible, or to be preferred by virtue of its generally superior authority.
2. Each reading must be examined on its merits, and preference must be given to those readings which are demonstrably in the style of the author under consideration.
3. Readings which explain other variants, but are not contrariwise themselves to be explained by the others, merit our preference; but this is a very subtle process, involving intangible elements, and liable to the subjective judgment on the part of the critic.¹⁹

An interesting note is added to the stated criteria of the Revision Committee in the words of Dr. Goodspeed, who states in his contributing article to the *Introduction* (and his words are especially relevant for the subject matter of this study):

But beyond all these aids we have had constant access to a score out of the great host of private translations which the past two centuries have produced from the time of William Whiston (*The Primitive New Testament*, 1745) and John Wesley (*The New Testament, with Notes*, 1755) down. These have shown the necessity of abandoning the old tendency to translate Paul word for word, in favor of a more vigorous and not less literal presentation of his thought.²⁰

There are those, however, who feel that the R. S. V. is not a revision at all, but a new translation instead, the claims of the Committee to the contrary notwithstanding. Undoubtedly the above reference of Dr. Goodspeed to the employment of other translations as well as the second and third points of the above-mentioned criteria listed by Dr. Grant might serve to create this impression.

The words of Oswald T. Allis bear out this claim:

The comparison of two of these versions is especially important because their respective authors, Doctor Moffatt and Doctor Goodspeed, were influential members of the committee which prepared the Revised Standard Version, Doctor Moffatt serving as its secretary until his death in 1944. This comparison will serve, we believe, to convince the reader that it is a misnomer to call the Revised Standard Version a "revision" of the Authorized Version and the Revised Version in any such sense, certainly, as the Re-

¹⁹ *Loc. cit.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

vised Version is a "revision" of the Authorized Version. It is a *modern speech* version. It belongs in the same general class with Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Berkeley, and the many similar versions which make no claim to be revisions of the old historic *Authorized Version*, but call themselves what they are, *new translations*. The Revised Standard Version should follow their example: call itself what it is and not claim to be what it is not.²¹

However, we feel that merely to compare (or contrast, as the case may be) the readings of the R. S. V. with the readings given by Weymouth, Moffatt, Goodspeed, and Verkuyl, without reference at all to the Greek text is handling the whole matter rather cavalierly and arbitrarily. After all, the King James Version was, we may assume, uppermost in the minds of the Committee, and that even before their charter was formed (cf. quotation with footnote 16). The remark of Sherman Johnson is very much to the point: "Every good translation, it has been well said, is a commentary. One cannot translate without interpreting, and the makers of the R. S. V. have faced up to their responsibility."²² Cadbury's remarks in the *Introduction* are to the point:

... mere alternatives in English expression do not reflect any substantial difference of opinion or uncertainty as to what the original means. . . . Several changes will be found in the English tenses used in this translation, due not so much to new knowledge of the Greek, or to new rules of translation, as to the freedom that the translators have exercised in trying to find the appropriate English idiom for sentences taken as a whole.²³

It will be noted in the articles just cited that both the authors speak of a "translation" when referring to the R. S. V. This is significant, because, in a sense, the R. S. V. is both. If we wish to revise the King James Version, and at the same time do a scholarly job of it, we naturally want to use the best available Greek text as a guide, which, as was mentioned before, was, for this Revision Committee, for the most part, the text of Westcott and Hort, B, κ , and frequently the Beatty papyri). The King James

²¹ *Revision or New Translation?* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1948), p. viii.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 86.

²³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 47, 50.

translators, however, had instead the *Textus Receptus*. There is bound to be a difference in the end results, and in this sense the R. S. V. is also a translation. But since their ultimate aim was to make the R. S. V. a legitimate bearer of the Tyndale-King James tradition, it is a revision. The outcome of this admittedly delicate problem (that is, using a Greek text superior to that used by the 1611 translators and yet following their pattern) is outlined in statistical form by Dean Weigle in the Committee's *Introduction*.²⁴

This is not to say, of course, that the Committee has in every case met this problem in a manner most desired by all. There are any number of points where improvement could be made. Wikgren echoes this sentiment specifically:

That there is, however, much increased precision in the revision is undeniable, and is illustrated by Cadbury himself.²⁵ It is only regrettable that the revisers have not consistently followed the excellent standards proclaimed by the *Introduction*. An indiscriminate rendering, for example, of Greek imperfects, aorists, and perfects is common; and disregard for tense-action also results here and there in a loss of exactness and vividness.²⁶

We used a quotation from Cadbury (with footnote 23) to justify renderings differing from the King James Version. But this same reviser also indicates a viewpoint which may have been responsible, in a number of cases at least, for the "indiscriminate renderings" referred to by Wikgren. He says: "As they [the first Christian authors] wrote with neither grammatical precision nor absolute verbal consistency, he (that is, the translator) is willing to deal somewhat less meticulously with the data of a simple style that was naturally not too particular about modes of expression or conscious of some of the subtleties which some later interpreters read into it. *To this he adds whatever he may modestly claim to have achieved of real insight into the meaning of the original.*"²⁷ (Italics our own.)

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44 ff.

²⁶ A. P. Wikgren, "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament," *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Harold R. Wiloughby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 388.

²⁷ *Introduction*, p. 52.

CHAPTER III

WHAT READINGS WERE USED?

As was mentioned in Chapter I, the findings of this chapter and the following are based on a study of textual variations in Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Of course, only those variants were considered which would affect the English translation in any way.

The procedure in the preparation of this chapter was as follows: The three Greek texts of Nestle, Tischendorf, and Westcott-Hort were first studied, and noteworthy variants were recorded by chapter and verse. These were then listed in columns, together with the readings of the R. S. V., the A. S. V. (American Standard Version, 1901), and the King James Version. In the last column the critical apparatus of Nestle was recorded for the particular passage in question. This arrangement brought some interesting statistics to light.

Of the thirty-nine passages recorded from the above-mentioned five Pauline letters, the R. S. V. agrees with the A. S. V. in twenty-three of these; the R. S. V. agrees with the Westcott-Hort readings in nineteen cases out of the thirty-nine, agrees with the King James in twenty-one cases out of the thirty-nine, and agrees with the readings of Tischendorf (eighth major ed.) in only eleven cases out of the thirty-nine. In nine instances the R. S. V. agreed with only one other authority. Otherwise there is agreement with two or three (never more) of the others. We break down these nine cases of agreement between the R. S. V. and only one other authority for a particular passage as follows: There are five such instances, surprisingly enough, where the R. S. V. and the King James only have the same readings; viz., Eph. 4:4; 5:2; 5:22; 6:12; and Col. 3:16. In three other cases the R. S. V. readings concur with the Westcott-Hort text only; viz., Col. 2:16; 4:15; and Philemon 6. In only one case, Gal. 2:16, does the R. S. V. agree only with the A. S. V.

In two other cases the R. S. V. readings stand alone, agreeing with none of the other four authorities; viz., Col. 1:20 (where the phrase under consideration, "by Him," is in brackets in Westcott-Hort), and 1:22.

While the Textus Receptus (also called Koine, Constantinopolitan, Imperial text) readings are admittedly inferior, the R. S. V. does favor its readings nineteen times in the thirty-nine passages studied. Of these nineteen cases, seventeen occur where one or more members of the Hesychian (Egyptian) group of manuscripts (B, \aleph , C) concur in that particular reading. However, the two remaining cases are extremely interesting. In Eph. 6:12 and Col. 3:16 the R. S. V. reading agrees with the Koine reading *against* all the rest. In Eph. 1:15 the R. S. V. reading agrees with the Koine, supported only by D and G. In the case of the Col. 3:16 citation, it should be noted that Codex Alexandrinus also agrees with the Koine, with only slight and insignificant variations, designated *A* in Nestle.

As might be expected, the R. S. V. as indicated in the Revision Committee's *Introduction*,²⁸ followed the Hesychian readings in the majority of cases (thirty-five out of thirty-nine). Of these thirty-five cases, eleven are readings given exclusively by B (Codex Vaticanus), four are readings given exclusively by \aleph (Codex Sinaiticus) and four others are given exclusively by C (Codex Ephraemi). In the remaining cases, two of the three manuscripts agree together on an R. S. V. reading. In the four remaining instances out of the above-mentioned thirty-nine, the R. S. V. adopts a reading found in *none* of the manuscripts of the Hesychian group. This unusual situation obtains in Eph. 1:15; 5:2; 6:12; and Col. 3:16. In only one of these four cases, Eph. 5:2, is the R. S. V. reading supported by p⁴⁶. Perhaps the additional support of p³³ in this same instance gave the necessary weight to the reading in question.

Strangely enough, while there are nineteen cases of agreement between the R. S. V. and the Koine, and also nineteen cases of agreement between the R. S. V. and the Westcott-Hort text, the two groups are not at all identical. This, however, is to be expected. In this tally, there are only seven instances where the R. S. V. reading agrees both with the Westcott-Hort and the Koine text.

The decisive combination for the revisers, as also indicated in the *Introduction*,²⁹ seems to be a reading of Vaticanus (or one other

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

of the Hesychian group), together with p⁴⁶. Where the R. S. V. used the Hesychian readings (thirty-five instances out of the total thirty-nine), sixteen of these cases are supported by p⁴⁶. Of these sixteen cases, thirteen occur as substantiating either B alone or B and either \aleph or C; one instance occurs (Gal. 2:16), where the R. S. V. reading is supported by p⁴⁶ and \aleph (Eph. 4:8), and one other case, where p⁴⁶ joins with C (Gal. 3:14) to support the R. S. V. reading.

The findings of this chapter do indeed bear out the contention that the revisers followed the eclectic principle in the determination of the text to be used, although it is evident from the foregoing statistics that they favored the Hesychian group (termed by them the "Alexandrian" group).

It should be remembered, however, that the area of investigation with which this study deals is not by any means a major portion of the New Testament, and we must accordingly be extremely cautious in drawing general inferences from these figures and applying these inferences to their treatment of the New Testament as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

IS THERE A PATTERN?

The revisers' use of the "eclectic principle"³⁰ is never more clearly demonstrated than when we attempt to find a pattern in their choice of readings. For the sake of clarity and expediency we have again subdivided the variant readings under consideration into four groups, according to the nature of the variant, whether it is a case of transposition, substitution, addition, or omission. In this chapter we shall discuss the types of variants in that order, attempting first to find a pattern in the subdivisions themselves, and then, on the basis of these conclusions, attempting to describe a possible pattern for this entire area of survey.

The variants classed under "Transposition" are restricted to Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians. In this class, Galatians has the largest representation; in fact, it is here that the greatest number of variants listed for Galatians is to be found.

The first citation is Gal. 1:3, where the R. S. V., agreeing with the A. S. V., Westcott-Hort, the King James, and Tischendorf

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

(a rare case; in fact, the *only* case where all five agree) reads: "... peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ." This reading is strongly supported by p⁴⁶⁻⁵¹, B, the Koine, D, G, and others, against the remainder of the Hesychian group (always consisting of \aleph , A, B, C, H, I, M, p^{10.13.15.16.32}, minuscules 6, 33, 81, 104, 326, 424, 1175, 1739, and others), minuscule 1912, and a number of others (designated *al* by Nestle), which read "... peace from God *our* Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Dr. Oscar Paret, in his extremely handy and picturesque volume,³¹ offers an interesting conjecture to explain the transposition in this passage, which he considers a *Schreibfehler*. In speaking of the Chester Beatty papyri he offers the information that the closing verses of Ephesians and the opening verses of Galatians were contained on the same page. Since the scribe had just finished copying τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν in the final line of Ephesians, and then came across the same, or somewhat the same, combination in Gal. 1:3, πατὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, he would therefore transpose the ἡμῶν to modify κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. While this interesting conjecture has its possibilities, the same argument could be used for the other reading, "the Lord Jesus Christ," since this form also occurs at the end of Ephesians, in the verse immediately preceding the above reference (6:24).

The second case of transposition occurs in Gal. 2:16. Actually a double transposition is involved, both dealing with the problem of whether to read "Jesus Christ" or "Christ Jesus." In this instance the revisers are consistent; they settle for "Jesus Christ . . . Christ Jesus," thereby adopting in both cases the readings of \aleph and C. Here it seems to be a case of "the majority rules," which, in some instances, is a rule of dubious value. In both these transpositions in Gal. 2:16, the readings of the R. S. V. oppose those of B and minuscule 33. The two forms adopted by the R. S. V. are, of course, much more widespread, almost to the point of being universally used. The revisers, however, seem to deprecate by their choice the age of the manuscript, although age also is no guarantee of superiority. But p⁴⁶ seems not to bear too much weight with them, and this can also be inferred from Dr. Grant's remarks in the

³¹ *Die Bibel, Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift* (2. durchgesehene Auflage; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950), p. 54

Introduction concerning it: "... in fact, we have consulted them (the Chester Beatty fragments) constantly, and have *occasionally* adopted readings from that source, when supported by others."³² (Italics our own.) The word "occasionally" seems to be substantiated by this Galatians 2 passage. In the first phrase it supports the R.S.V.; in the second, it is opposed to it. However, this phenomenon indicates, to their advantage, no a priori acceptance by the revisers of any one particular manuscript. It will be noted also that, as far as these transpositions are concerned, there is only one other case where p⁴⁶ is opposed to the R.S.V. reading—Phil. 1:6. This passage, however, presents an interesting situation and will be reviewed in more detail after the consideration of the Gal. 3:14 passage and the two Ephesians passages.

The reading of Gal. 3:14, again involving a transposition of 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is, as far as textual support of the R.S.V. is concerned, almost an exact duplicate of the textual support for the first phrase considered in Gal. 2:16, except for the fact that, in this case, \aleph is ranged along with B against the R.S.V. reading. Taking \aleph 's place, so to speak, on the side of the R.S.V. reading is Alexandrinus (A). As we discuss the other three subheads, it will be noted that on three or four other occasions the readings of B and \aleph are rejected by the R.S.V. in favor of the Koine tradition, usually, as here, supported by C (Codex Ephraemi), A, and occasionally also p⁴⁶.

For the sake of pointing out a very obvious and striking contrast, we jump ahead momentarily into the last subhead, concerned with omissions. There, with the exception of p⁴⁶, which again supports the R.S.V. reading, *the order is exactly the opposite* from what obtained here in Gal. 3:14, that is, the MSS which favor the R.S.V. reading in 3:14 are opposed to the reading in 5:21, and the manuscripts *rejecting* the R.S.V. reading in 3:14 are the same ones (with the exception noted) which favor the 5:21 reading! Going back again to the subdivision of transposition, we come to Ephesians 1:1, again concerning the phrase Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ, where the evidence in support of the text of the R.S.V. represents a phenomenon similar to the one in Gal. 5:21, alluded to in the preceding paragraph. There is this difference, however: p⁴⁶ and B, favoring the

³² P. 42.

R. S. V. reading, are also backed by D and minuscule 33. If we substitute Codex H (Cyprus) for Codex D, we have almost the same group of manuscripts which, in the case of Gal. 2:16, *opposed* the R. S. V., whereas in Ephesians 1 they support it. To whatever shortcomings the revisers were prone, rigid consistency was not one of them.

The next passage to be considered in this group is Eph. 3:18, where the R. S. V. has the reading "... to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth" over against the variant reading "depth and height." The manuscript evidence supporting the R. S. V. reading in *this* case certainly is not open to question. It is very ably supported by p⁴⁶, B, C, D, B and the Vulgate and some Old Latin manuscripts, although superiority of numbers seems to be opposed to the reading. Nestle here cites \aleph , A, the Koine, and *pm* (*permulti* — the majority of the remaining witnesses). It is understood, of course, that actual superiority in numbers of manuscripts in favor of one or the other reading cannot be determined merely by the designations *alii* (others) and *permulti*. We can only estimate.

The last passage dealing with transposition of words is Phil. 1:6, to which reference was made above as presenting an interesting situation. The passage again involves $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ 'Ιησοῦ. While it is true that the Hesychian group (B excepted), G, K, and many others favor this reading, Westcott-Hort lists the other form 'Ιησοῦ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ as being of equal validity. It would seem, then, that if Westcott and Hort considered the evidence equally weighty for both readings, the discovery and use of another ancient and authoritative manuscript would tip the scales one way or another. p⁴⁶ goes along with B, the Koine, D, and others, yet the revisers chose the opposite reading. As was mentioned before, this is the second case where, as far as transpositions are concerned, the R. S. V. rejects the evidence of p⁴⁶.

It should also be noted that in the case of *every* passage cited under this subhead, the R. S. V. reading agrees with the readings of the A. S. V. This statement is not made in a condemnatory vein, but is offered as the writer's answer to the problem of why the R. S. V. on one occasion uses a reading attested by certain manuscripts and elsewhere adopts another reading which almost all of

these same manuscripts reject. The readings given here do not involve a point of doctrine. On the other hand, the Committee's instructions³³ were to revise the A.S.V., and since the details involved were minute and unimportant, it can readily be understood why the Committee might want to revise the A.S.V. no more than necessary. This, of course, is only a supposition, another being offered later in this chapter.

The next subdivision, that concerned with substitutions, like the subsequent one dealing with additions, has a much larger representation among the passages studied. In fact, these two subdivisions together comprise two thirds of the passages studied, which means, significantly enough, that the majority of the passages in question deal either with a change in the phrase itself or an addition of some kind.

In the first three passages to be considered under this particular subdivision, Gal. 4:19; 4:28; and Eph. 5:2 (the first part of the verse — there being two variants to be taken up in this verse), another striking divergence in choice of readings on the part of the revisers is in evidence, a discrepancy which we are at a loss to explain. In Gal. 4:19, where the R.S.V. uses *τεκνία*, "little children," instead of *τέκνα*, "children," and in Gal. 4:28, where the R.S.V. uses "we, brethren," instead of "you," in both cases the R.S.V. renderings are supported by the same group of witnesses, A, C, the Koine, and *pl* (*plerique* — most witnesses) and *pm* (*per-multi* — the majority of remaining witnesses) respectively, with the one exception that the Gal. 4:28 passage, according to the R.S.V., has the additional support of *κ*. This situation is very similar to the one obtaining in the previous subdivision, where the Galatians passages cited were similarly supported (see above). But, in the case of Eph. 5:2: "... as Christ loved *us* and gave Himself up for *us*," this R.S.V. reading, unlike all the preceding citations, does not agree with the A.S.V. reading. Furthermore, and here is where the striking divergence referred to comes in, the manuscripts *opposed* to this reading of the R.S.V. are *κ*, B, C, and A! Support for this reading is given by p⁴⁶, the Koine, D, G, the majority of remaining witnesses, the Latin, and the Syriac. There seems to be absolutely no reason for this choice of reading, espe-

³³ *Supra*, chapter II.

cially in view of Streeter's remark regarding the authenticity of B and κ : "The text of B κ , being held innocent of this free treatment of the original, acquired the credit which always attaches to a respectable witness as against one known to be in some respects disreputable."³⁴

The second substitution in Eph. 5:2 presents no problem. The reading "... and given Himself for us" is supported by all manuscripts except B, 69, and a few others of no special importance.

The next passage under consideration, Phil. 2:30, concerning the phrase "the work of Christ" as in the R. S. V., is opposed only by Westcott-Hort, and by κ , A, P, and other less important manuscripts. This is noteworthy because here is one case where Tischendorf does not follow the reading of κ . We can have no argument here with the revisers' choice, since the reading is substantiated by all the other manuscripts.

Of the remaining seven passages under this subdivision the R. S. V.'s treatment of four of them, Col. 1:7; 1:12; 3:13; and Philemon 6, offer no special problems of the kind we have considered in the foregoing pages. In each case the manuscript evidence is sufficiently strong for the reading chosen by the revisers. With the exception of Philemon 6, there is agreement in every case with the A. S. V.

But the remaining three passages again show some surprising choices on the part of the revisers. In the case of Col. 2:16, the manuscript witnesses *for* the R. S. V. readings are about the same (p⁴⁶, B, 1739, Syriac) as those *rejecting* the reading chosen by the revisers in Gal. 6:12. There the manuscript evidence *opposed* to the R. S. V. reading shows up as follows: p⁴⁶, B, 69, 1175. While the R. S. V. reading in Gal. 6:12 is still in agreement with the A. S. V., this is not the case with Col. 2:16. A purely arbitrary choice on the part of the revisers, at least in this case, seems to be the only solution to the enigma.

A similar situation confronts us in the case of Col. 3:4. The phrase in question "Christ . . . our life," favored by the revisers over the alternative "Christ . . . your life," is rejected by p⁴⁶, the Hesychian group with the exception of B, then rejected also by D, G, most of the others, and the Latin. Now this is almost the

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 132.

same manuscript evidence which *supports* the R. S. V. reading of Col. 1:7, with the sole exception of substituting C for B as above. Since in the case both of Col. 3:4 and 1:7, the R. S. V. readings agree with those of the A. S. V., this seems to be the only reason for this contradictory choice of readings.

The next subdivision, involving additional words in the text, contains twelve examples of this form of variant. The large majority of these are well supported by reliable manuscript evidence. The readings of the R. S. V. for three passages in this group, however, merit closer attention. In the case of Eph. 1:15 the phrase "and your love" is omitted by p⁴⁶, B, \aleph , A, and a few others. Since the R. S. V. reading again agrees with the A. S. V. reading, and since the R. S. V. is also supported by the Koine tradition, D, G, and many others, besides the Latin and Syriac versions, sheer weight of numbers seems to have been the deciding factor in this case.

The choice of the revisers with regard to Eph. 6:12 is even more puzzling. The phrase in question "this present darkness" is supported only by the Koine (and the King James, of course), and many other less significant witnesses. All the other major witnesses, when not listed in Nestle's footnotes, are presumed to follow the reading of Nestle's text, which omits the τοῦ αἰῶνος according to the "Explanations for the Greek New Testament," preceding the text.³⁵ It would seem that the relative importance and authority attached to the various manuscripts carried no weight at all in this case. In passing it should also be mentioned that a similar situation obtains in the case of Col. 3:16, except that the R. S. V. rendering there is supported, in addition to the witnesses cited for the Eph. 6:12 rendering, also by A. Again the R. S. V.'s rendering agrees only with that of the King James.

Col. 1:22 again presents a striking case of contradictory choices. The R. S. V. reading here, "by His death," is not found in the A. S. V., Westcott-Hort, the King James, or in Tischendorf. In fact, the only manuscript support of this reading is listed by Nestle as being \aleph , A, 1912, and *pm* (*permulti*—many others), and the Peshitta Syriac. If we substitute minuscule 1739 for 1912, we have again the same combination of manuscript witnesses which *opposed* the R. S. V. reading in the case of Eph. 3:9!

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 78*.

The fourth and last subdivision of variants, the one dealing with omissions, consists of nine passages containing a variant of this nature.

The very first passage under this heading, Gal. 5:21, where the R. S. V. omits "murder" in the list of the works of the flesh, is well supported by p⁴⁶, B, \aleph , 33, a few others, and also by Marcion. However, the chief manuscripts opposing this reading, that is, those which include "murder," A, C, the Koine, D*, G, are the same witnesses which *support* the R. S. V. rendering of Col. 1:12 under the second subdivision.

The R. S. V. reading of Gal. 6:12, "the cross of Christ," where some manuscripts have "the cross of Christ Jesus," again demonstrates an interesting phenomenon. It is *opposed* only by p⁴⁶, B, and minuscules 69 and 1175. Returning again to Col. 2:16 under the second subdivision, we note that the R. S. V. reading there is *supported* only by p⁴⁶, B, minuscule 1739, and the Peshitta Syriac.

The revisers' choice in the case of Eph. 4:4 is even more difficult to defend. The reading there involves the use or rejection of the word "also" in the phrase "just as (also) you were called. . . ." The R. S. V. eliminates the "also" and so does the King James. Westcott-Hort put the reading in brackets, and Tischendorf and the A. S. V. both include it in the text. There is, however, extremely little support among the manuscripts. Only B, a few others, the Vulgate, some of the Old Latin versions, and the Peshitta Syriac favoring the R. S. V. rendering. A preference for the King James at this point on the part of the revisers, for whatever reason, seems to be the only explanation for this particular choice.

Again, in the case of Col. 1:3, where the R. S. V. has "God the Father," which agrees with the A. S. V. and Westcott-Hort, numerical superiority of manuscripts seems to be on the side of the reading "God *and* the Father." The only manuscript witnesses for the R. S. V. reading are B, C*, and the Syriac versions, whereas the King James and Tischendorf rendering is supported by \aleph , the Koine tradition, many other (*plerique*), and the Vulgate.

It would seem from a study of the passages cited in this chapter, and the readings in these passages adopted by the revisers, that there was not always a regard for the weight of manuscript evidence in the choice of a particular reading. Colwell's remark is very much to the point: "One of the faults of the Revised Standard

Version is an unnecessary inconsistency. In general, it does not show the result of careful attention to the problem of accuracy in the source which is to be expected in a recent work."³⁶ Since, however, in the passages cited in this chapter the revisers' choice favored once the A. S. V. and then the King James where manuscript evidence would have called for a different reading, we submit the suggestion that the revisers attempted a compromise between these two versions where no question of literary style or important variations, such as the longer or shorter ending of Mark, were involved. In view of the Revision Committee's instructions³⁷ to consider both the A. S. V. and the King James when preparing this new translation, the inconsistency of the revisers is, to a certain extent, excusable. Yet, we think of the fourth rule in Wikgren's canons of criticism as quoted by Colwell: "The quality rather than the quantity of witnesses is more important in determining a reading."³⁸ And in none of the other canons of criticism, whether put forth by Tischendorf, Porter, Wettstein, Hammond, Wikgren, Colwell, or any others, is there anything to the effect that an earlier *English* version can be the deciding factor in choosing a particular reading.

We also note in passing that of the fourteen passages listed under Ephesians, ten show agreement between the R. S. V. and King James. A bird's-eye view of the territory covered in this chapter also shows a preference on the part of the revisers for the reading "Christ Jesus" over "Jesus Christ" and a preference for "we," "our," "us," over "you" and "yours."

This chapter, it seems, shows the revisers' "eclectic principle" frequently, and often arbitrarily, used.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Such is the picture of the R. S. V. derived from a tabulation of readings by several of the leading versions; a tabulation of manuscript evidence in support of, or in opposition to, these readings;

³⁶ Ernest Cadman Colwell, *What Is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 91, 92.

³⁷ *Supra*, chapter II.

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

and an attempt to ascertain how closely the revisers followed the best principles of textual criticism, at the same time carrying out their commission to neglect neither the A. S. V. nor the King James.

We have pointed out (Chapter II) that the R. S. V. is not strictly a revision, and the revisers themselves, as was pointed out, indicated that this latest effort to clothe the New Testament in modern English dress sometimes took on aspects of a new (and sometimes free) translation. In that chapter was also a forecast of what was to become very evident in subsequent chapters, viz., that the Revision Committee felt free to add, in the words of Dr. Cadbury, "whatever he (the translator) may modestly claim to have achieved of real insight into the meaning of the original."³⁹

In the third chapter we noted the interesting phenomena that while the R. S. V. agreed most frequently with the A. S. V., it agreed only slightly less frequently with the King James and the Westcott-Hort versions, and it agreed about equally with the last two versions.

In line with good textual-critical procedure the revisers, in the large majority of cases, accepted readings of the Hesychian group and gave some attention (though not as much as might be desired) to p⁴⁶, generally following a combination of these.

The fourth chapter revealed, by examination of the witnesses for a particular reading, that the revisers' choice was frequently of a dubious nature, from the standpoint of manuscript support and could be justified only by their intention to strike a sort of *aurea mediocritas* between the A. S. V. and the King James.

This survey was intended as a sort of supplement to other surveys of a similar nature by Wikgren, Allis, Cadbury, Johnson, and others, which dealt with the Gospels especially and the larger Pauline Epistles. It was also the finding of these other surveys, as was pointed out in the several quotations, that the revisers' "eclectic principle" was too freely used, or at least, used more often than was desirable.

As the revisers had no preconceived partiality toward the Westcott-Hort text, but found afterwards that they did favor it in the majority of cases,⁴⁰ we had likewise formed no judgment or opinion

³⁹ *An Introduction*, p. 52.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

beforehand regarding their overuse of the "eclectic principle," although other surveys which we consulted had already indicated this overuse.

The concluding remark in Wikgren's survey aptly and concisely summarizes the findings of this survey also: "Thus, while the R. S. V. of the New Testament faces, Januslike, in two directions at once, it nevertheless represents a significant step in the achievement of the most accurate English text, and in the emancipation of the English Bible from the fetters of archaism."⁴¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLIS, OSWALD T. *Revision or New Translation?* Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1948.
- Bible, Holy.* American Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.
- . King James Version, 1611.
- . Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- CADBURY, HENRY J. "The Vocabulary and Grammar of New Testament Greek." *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.* International Council of Religious Education, 1946.
- COLWELL, ERNEST CADMAN. *What Is the Best New Testament?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- GRANT, FREDERICK C. "The Greek Text of the New Testament." *Loc. cit.*
- JOHNSON, SHERMAN E. "The Revised Standard Version." *Anglican Theological Review*, XXX (April, 1948).
- KENYON, FREDERICK G. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible.* (Schweich Lectures.) London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- . *The Text of the Greek Bible.* London: Duckworth, 1949.
- NESTLE, EBERHARD, editor. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, editio duodevicesima, 1948.
- PARET, OSCAR. *Die Bibel, Ihre Ueberlieferung in Druck und Schrift.* Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950.
- PRICE, IRA M. *The Ancestry of Our English Bible.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.
- SOUTER, ALEXANDER. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament.* Edinburgh: T. & A. Constable, Ltd., 1948.
- STREETER, B. H. *The Four Gospels.* London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951.
- TISCHENDORF, CONSTANTINE, editor. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, editio octava critica maior, 1869.
- WESTCOTT, B. F. and F. J. HORT, editors. *The Greek New Testament.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882.
- WIKGREN, ALLEN PAUL. "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament." *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow.* Edited by HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 388.

HOMILETICS

Outlines on Hannover Epistles

(See previous issue, September, 1953, p. 688, for listing of the entire series)

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT

ROM. 2:12-24

A new church year begins today. The church calendar provides for a complete, systematic coverage of those divine truths which we need for our salvation and sanctification. Christ remains in the center. Let us never become weary of repeated presentation but rather strive to grow in the knowledge of, and faith in, Christ and His Word. Whether ignorant of Him or intimately acquainted with Him, it still remains true:

EVERYONE NEEDS CHRIST

I

The Ignorant Heathen Needs Christ

A. *He is the man without the written Law.* He is the Gentile, who is ignorant of God's written Law (v. 12 a). He is the man without a Bible or a Catechism listing and explaining the Ten Commandments. He is the man who lives in the African jungles, and he may be the man who lives next door. A Gentile may be a woman, a child, or one of the millions of unchurched and spiritually unschooled in a civilized and highly educated nation.

B. *The heathen is a sinner,* one of the many (v. 12 a), one of the "all" (Rom. 3:23). His sins may receive no notice in the papers or go unnoticed among his associates, though God knows. Ignorant of the written Law, he remains condemned by that Law. Unless he finds the one way of escape, he will perish.

C. *He cannot plead ignorance* on Judgment Day. God's Law is in his heart (at least a partial knowledge), and he has a conscience (vv. 14, 15). Evidence of this fact are an inner compulsion to live right, however superficially, and conflicting thoughts that run through his mind, either excusing (minimizing the guilt, blaming it on others, on environment, ignorance, etc.) or accusing

(feeling of guilt, despair, etc.) him. The divine Judge will point an accusing finger at him and say, "You are without excuse." This is Paul's clear answer to the much-asked question: "Will the ignorant heathen be saved without Christ?"

D. He needs Christ *for God to forgive him*. There is no other way (Acts 4:12). The decisive question on Judgment Day will be: "Did you accept Christ as the Bearer of your sin and guilt, as your Redeemer?" The knowledge of salvation in Christ is not in the natural heart and conscience (Rom. 10:14). The good news, proclaimed by Paul and others, must be brought to the unregenerate sinner.

E. *The Christians must reveal the Gospel of Christ to him*. If he steps into this church on any given Sunday during this year of grace, I promise that he will hear about Christ. You can help. You can urgently invite him to sit with you in the pew. Also you can invite him to any adult class conducted here. You can talk to him personally. Spiritual ignorance abounds everywhere; therefore support the mission program of your church.

The ignorant heathen is not the only one who needs Christ.

II

The Professing Christian Needs Christ

A. *He is acquainted with God's written Law*. Many a one boasts of his knowledge as did the Jews (vv. 17, 18). They had reason to boast. They were well indoctrinated. It is the privilege of the professing Christian to be able to recite the Ten Commandments and their meaning. He has the printed Bible to complete and clarify God's Law in his mind, which is but imperfect in his natural heart and conscience. But a mere knowledge of God's written Law will not save a man on Judgment Day. Has he kept what he knows?

B. *He is a sinner*, just as much as the man without the Law (v. 12 b) and stands in the same condemnation. At this point, however, we must make a distinction between the hypocrite and the genuine Christian.

1. *The hypocrite*, who professes to be a Christian, does not acknowledge his sins and bemoan them. He is like the Jews, whom Paul exposed (vv. 17-24) as thieves, adulterers, perpetrators

of sacrilege, blasphemous offenders. They were good at telling others how the Law read and easily exposed the sins of others. But their own sins they did not recognize. Hence they felt no need of a Savior.

2. *The genuine Christian* also sins. He may be guilty of any or all sins committed by the hypocrite. But the Law convicts him in his conscience. He pleads guilty and expresses his sorrow.

C. He, too, needs Christ, *because he continues to sin even after his conversion.*

1. To know Christ, of course, is essential. He must know who Christ is, why He was born, how He lived on earth and why. He must be acquainted with His vicarious suffering, death, and resurrection. To know Him merely intellectually, however, is not enough.

2. He must know Him in his heart, or believe in Him. And this faith must grow; else it will die. Faith grows by the hearing of God's Word (Rom. 10:17; the Parable of the Sower) and the devout use of the Sacraments. As the Christian grows in faith, his life becomes purer and brighter, he being willingly guided by the revealed will of God. Do not neglect the means of grace if you would grow in Christ.

This year of grace is not different from the past. Everyone will need Christ. The heathen will need Him; let us help him find His Savior. I shall need Him, because I am a weak sinner. I shall need His daily forgiveness, His power to make me strong in faith and love.

St. Louis, Mo.

ALVIN C. MACK

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT

ROM. 3:1-18

The Second Sunday in Advent concludes the thought of the First Sunday. On the First Sunday the thought of the day was our Lord's first coming in humility. Today the thought is His second coming in glory, when He shall stand in His bare terribleness to judge the quick and the dead. The words of our text remind us that the Law condemns all and that none can be saved by the Law. The Law makes the impending and inescapable Judgment terrible.

Only faith in Jesus Christ as the Crucified Savior can rescue us from the terrors of the Judgment. Those who do know Christ by faith look toward Judgment Day with joyful anticipation. "The Lord will cause His glorious voice to be heard, and ye shall have gladness of heart" (Introit). The Collect bids us to stir up our hearts to make ready His way. We stir up our hearts this day by considering that

THE TRUE GOD COMES TO JUDGE

I

God Was True in Giving the Law

- A. (V.4) God is the God of Truth (Titus 1:2; Ps. 116:11; 51:4; 62:9).
- B. (V.2) God gave His truth in the Law (Deut. 4:7, 8).
- C. (V.3) God's true Law cannot be changed by unbelief (Matt. 5:18, 19).

II

God Is True in Condemning Failure to Keep the Law

- A. (Vv. 9-18) Both Jew and Gentile fail to keep the Law (Ps. 14:1-3; 5:9; 140:3; 10:7; Is. 59:7, 8; Ps. 36:1; Rom. 3:28).
- B. (V.4) God's truthfulness stands out clearly in contrast to man's failure to keep the Law (Ps. 51:4).
- C. (Vv. 5-8) God is true in condemning all who fail to keep the Law (Rom. 7:7; 8:31; 6:19; Gal. 3:15).

III

God Is True in Giving the Way of Faith to Escape Condemnation in the Judgment (Matt. 18:10-14; 1 Tim. 2:4)

- A. Christ the True God fulfilled the Law for us (Matt. 5:17).
- B. Christ the Truth redeemed us from the curse of the Law (Gal. 3:13; Rom. 3:24, 25; 1 John 1:9; John 14, 1 ff.).
- C. Christ the True God judges.
 - 1. He carries out the condemnation of those who have failed to keep the Law (Matthew 24).
 - 2. He gives salvation to those who look to Him by faith (Rom. 3:22).

Each year everyone is happy to see Christmas come. The Christian and non-Christian celebrate. But when Christ comes again only the Christian will have reason to celebrate. The non-Christian will be terrified because the true God comes to judge.

We see ourselves condemned by the Law. Take Christ by faith. By faith we look forward to Judgment Day happily in anticipation of the joys of heaven.

Suggested hymns: 68, 610, 72.

Mascoutah, Ill.

WILLIAM E. GOERSS

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

ROM. 10:11-18

Christmas preparations and gifts occupy us. What are you going to receive? There's a present for you under God's tree, the best you will receive, both for this life and the next.

His gift will transform your life into something beautiful. Kinsey's recent report on *Sexual Behavior of the Human Female* called religion the greatest deterrent to immorality. The power of God for good is also everywhere evident in lives of God's people. Charities, kindnesses, at Christmas.

Hope stemming from sonship will be yours in trials. The standard Gospel for the day: John's faith sustained by considering how Christ's life verified His Messiahship.

The bliss of heaven after this life the greatest blessing of this gift.

WILL THIS GREAT GIFT OF GOD BE YOURS?

It will:

I. If You Believe

II. And You Will Believe, if You Hear

III. And You Will Hear, if the Word Is Preached

IV. Unless You Willfully Refuse It

I

Faith Alone

A. It makes no difference who you are. No difference between Jew or Greek. Earthly distinctions are valueless. Not "blood and

soil" of Hitler, "party" of Communism, social register of high society; not family, not political power, not wealth, not race; not degrees, high school diploma, union card; not character, not avoidance of sin, not good works.

B. Whosoever shall call! Anyone may. Nothing more required. But to "call" you must realize your own helplessness. "We thought we heard the angels sing." Eddie Rickenbacker's story of men who learned to believe on the Pacific.

C. You can trust God to answer. His promises are true. Recall fulfilled prophecies of Christmas: Virgin Birth, Is. 7:14 (how); Bethlehem, Micah 5:2 (where); Shiloh, Gen. 49:10 (when).

D. Trust — What God? — The Lord (Joel 2:32). Paul equates Jesus and Jehovah. Jesus is Jehovah's greatest self-revelation. When you know what Jesus has done for you (Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, vv. 6, 7, 9), then you will trust Him enough to call on Him, viz., "believe in," "worship," "pray to." Faith worked by faithful performance of promises. A grocer will trust a good customer because of previous good performance. So you can trust God. This belief, that God who sent Jesus, His Son, to save you, will never disappoint or fail you (v. 11).

II

The Word Works Faith

A. You want to believe that, but you say you can't?

B. Nature witnesses to such a God (Might, Wisdom, Love), v. 18. Still true today.

C. Word penetrated then to remotest areas through Jews (v. 18 b). Radio, TV, missionaries today.

D. Word of God gives us full truth. Tells us truth about ourselves and about God. Pictures love for sinners possible through Christ.

E. Whole Bible and only Bible, no amending (Modernists), no adding (R. C. C., Eddyites, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses).

F. Holy Spirit uses Word to penetrate our hard hearts and work faith (v. 17; Rom. 1:16; 1 Peter 1:22 ff.) Thus God constantly

brought men to Himself. Paul a wonderful example. The jailer at Philippi. You, too, have become a believer by hearing the Word. The Word must be spread to win others.

III

The Word Must Be Preached

A. Hear it means to listen to it (v. 17). Studying the Word ourselves, church, private reading, family altar, Bible distribution, tracts — good but not enough.

B. Hearing also means to obey (v. 16), to apply, to practice, the Gospel.

C. But teaching and preaching are necessary to insure right Scripture to each individual, reach unlearned, to emphasize Law and Gospel (vv. 14, 15 b). Should be heard Sunday morning, evening, and weekday.

D. Commissioning important (v. 15 a). God wants no unauthorized preachers and teachers. Trained men are best. Hence joining congregations and sending missionaries are requisite. This is the great work of the Church, the real reason for the existence of congregation and Synod. Have you joined?

IV

It Can Be Refused

A. The parable of the brick. A loose brick a danger, but in a wall it has a function. So individual in relation to church; congregation to Synod. A loose brick must be cast away.

B. God compels no one to take His gift. Can hear without believing. Like the men of Ulysses whose ears were stopped with wax so as not to hear the song of the Sirens. We can stop our ears with wax of selfish indulgence and indifference.

C. But without gift we are lost. How tragic (v. 21).

The Christ who gained forgiveness for you by coming, dying, rising, who is presented in the Gospel, is God's great Gift. By believing you have peace here and eternal life beyond.

Take this Gift, and make it yours always.

San Francisco, Calif.

ARTHUR C. NITZ

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

ROM. 11:14-32

The Hannover Epistle for the Fourth Sunday in Advent is taken from Paul's Epistle to the Romans, that masterpiece of the New Testament which Luther says "deserves not only to be known word for word by every Christian but to be the subject of his meditation day by day, the daily bread of his soul."

The text itself does not mention the Savior as directly as do most of the lessons for the day, but if we relate it properly to Rom. 3:21-26, the center of the epistle, we have what we need. This relationship will then also come forth in the treatment of the text.

The lessons for the day stress humility in approaching Christ and the urgent need of accepting Him. Cp. the Baptist's testimony (John 1 and 3), Mary's in the Magnificat (Luke 1:46 ff.), Paul's assurance that God would have all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:1-6), and his plea that we show moderation to all men (Phil. 4:4-7), and John's reference to the fellowship in the Gospel (1 John 1:1-4). A reading of these lessons will help to give the necessary background for the proper treatment of the text.

The text is lengthy but so closely woven together that there is no difficulty in keeping to a unit thought. The exegetical difficulties are more apparent than real. A few brief remarks may, however, be in place. The mystery referred to in v. 25 is this, that among the proud, haughty Jews whose hardness of heart rules out salvation, there are still those who, in every age to the end of the world, can and will be won for Christ. These are meant by Paul when he speaks of all Israel being saved. All Israelites whom God in eternity included among the elect, from Abraham to the last Jew to be saved, all will be saved. The rejection of the nation does not rule out God's mercy to these elect. They may for a time appear as enemies of the Gospel (v. 28), but, like Paul himself, they will be converted by the grace of God.

God does not even let the rejection of Christ by the Jews remain without its blessed results. Their rejection ushers in a special time of grace for the Gentiles (vv. 28, 30). God did not cause their unbelief. He, however, turned their evil into good for the Gentiles,

showing them mercy and not withholding it from repentant Israelites.

Now a brief suggestion as to the treatment of the text. To keep the picture of the text we could speak of

GRAFTED BRANCHES IN THE TREE OF LIFE

- I. *We draw the same nourishment as the original branches, vv. 17, 18.* (Patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, shepherds, all were Israelites, as was Jesus Himself; but we share their blessings in fullest measure. No difference here.)
- II. *We face the same danger of being pruned out, vv. 20, 21.* (If even the Israelitish kings and leaders were rejected. . . .)
- III. *We have the privilege of growing with the tree as branches are added in abundance, vv. 25 ff.* (No need to remove branches to make room for others. A glorious growing together in Christ regardless of where we came from.)

In view of the season of the church year it may be better to drop the figure of the text and simply develop the thought that

GOD GIVES GRACE TO THE HUMBLE

- I. *Fully, Whether to Jew or Gentile*
- II. *Only the Proud Have No Place with Jesus*
- III. *Constantly, Even to the Fallen if They Repent; e. g., Paul himself*

A fitting conclusion is Paul's own doxology, which follows immediately upon the text.

Springfield, Ill.

MARK J. STEEGE

CHRISTMAS

1 Tim. 3:14-16

A woman member of the community Christmas Tree Lighting Committee called her pastor for suggestions for the musical portion of the program, complaining that traditional songs and carols are "so distressingly theological." She was reminded that the first Christmas was, after all, a rather theological affair. Our text includes a portion of an early Christian song, a very theological song, containing a summary statement of what Christmas is all about.

"GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH" * — THE MYSTERY OF
CHRISTMAS AND WHAT THAT MYSTERY REVEALS

I

"God Was Manifest in the Flesh" — a Great Mystery

A. The mystery of Christmas does not consist of some mysterious mood. — Festival has become cluttered. Even the heart of the Christmas story garlanded with irrelevant details, while meaning of story has been generalized into the least common denominator of vague belief. Little more than sentimental feeling of good will.

B. The mystery of Christmas lies in the birth at Bethlehem.

1. A child is born. — Here the Christmas story may be told, but the sermon should go on to show that mystery of Christmas is not just the magic of babyhood. Many love the Babe of Bethlehem simply as a baby, a cuddly plaything, awakening feelings of tenderness mingled with dreams of a lost childhood. This called religion. A purely Christmas religion, a religion of sentiment. "The little Lord Jesus laid down His sweet head." Sweet He is and little, but to play idly with this Baby is to play with fire, for

2. This Child is Christ, our God and Lord.

a. The mystery in this. — Greek mystery religions celebrated deification of man, Christmas celebrates incarnation of God. This is the mystery, "seen of angels" (text), heralded by them, yet a source of wonder even to them (1 Peter. 1:12). The Lord of heaven made even a "little lower" than they (Heb. 2:7).

b. The depths of the mystery. — "This shall be a sign, etc." (Luke 2:12). Strange contradiction: "Christ the Lord," but swaddling clothes and a manger for a sign. Christian piety has done much to soften contradiction. Animals stand about in mute admiration (which is faith's recognition that Child is King of Crea-

* The correct reading is very likely not *theos* but the masculine relative pronoun *hos*. The substitution, however, in no way alters the sense, for He who was manifested in the Incarnation was clearly present in the bosom of the Father before that manifestation. The whole tenor of New Testament theology demands this interpretation. A supplemental use of the R. S. V. is, at any rate, desirable for this passage. The phrase "mystery of godliness" is ambiguous, to say the least, and the translation of the second line of the hymn is difficult to interpret as it stands in the A. V.

tion, but in unadorned fact animals were probably annoyed that the little Stranger interfered with their feeding). Christ himself is pictured with halo around head and with all of wonder and wisdom of eternity in His face. Faith's recognition that He is eternal Son of the Father. But in unadorned fact, again, He was six or seven pounds of hungry, weak, and needy humanity. "Wrapped in swaddling clothes," diapers, perfect symbol of human weakness. "And was made man."

c. The *unsearchable* depths of the mystery.—The mystery of Christmas, prepared by God (1 Cor. 2:7) and hidden in His eternal will (Eph. 3:9), has become a fact of history in the Incarnation. St. Paul uses the word "mystery" to designate "a hidden thing now revealed." Yet for us it must remain a "confessedly great" mystery. It is like this: The sun, shining in full splendor, is hardly more accessible to sight than when hidden by a cloud. But we know the sun is there, for we can see clearly everything else. And so—

II

"God Was Manifest in the Flesh"—a Wondrous Revelation

A. Christmas reveals the love of God.—Note only the condescension of God's love. He stoops to conquer, coming to earth and entering through lowly door of His mother's womb. C. S. Lewis suggests picture of strong man stooping lower and lower to get himself underneath some great complicated burden. He must stoop in order to lift, almost disappearing until, incredibly, he rises and marches off with the whole mass on his shoulders.

B. Christmas reveals the hope of man.

1. Man needs a Savior.—Symptoms of need suggested by Christmas story are the selfishness of the people of Bethlehem ("no room" for others in our inverted lives) and the fear of the shepherds ("sore afraid" in our mean, befouled lives before the glory and holiness of God).

2. The Savior man needs is the Child of Bethlehem.

a. He is Our Brother.—The Child of Bethlehem, our little Brother, born into the fellowship of human suffering through the pain of His mother. Able to sympathize (Heb. 4:15).

b. Our Substitute.—Weakness, lowliness, and poverty reveal

shadow of Cross already over birth of this Child. When He died, He was once more absolutely poor, His one piece of clothing divided by soldiers. "*For our sakes* He became poor" (2 Cor. 8:9). The "for us" of Christ's life was vindicated on Easter when "He was justified, vindicated by the Spirit" (text, cf. Rom. 1:3,4).

C. Christmas reveals the future of the universe.—Though Christ was "received up into glory" (text), He is still the Incarnate One. His life is still identified with the stuff of our universe. The heavenly reality has invaded this tired old world. The full implications of this wait to be revealed. (Cosmic aspects of Incarnation best illustrated from Colossians, also Rom. 8:18 ff.)

D. Christmas reveals the mission of the Church.

1. The Church has a message to proclaim.—Mystery of Christmas not to be kept secret as were the revelations in Greek mystery religions. It is to be "preached unto the Gentiles" by the Church, which is "the pillar and ground of truth" (text; cf. Luke 2:10, also the missionary activity of the shepherds). And this mystery, incredible though it is, will be "believed on in the world."

2. The Church has a life to exhibit.—The Church, as Christ's body, is the extension of His incarnate life. Our text calls the Church the "house of God," the place where He dwells on earth. The Church is our Bethlehem, our Immanuel, our "God with us."

The ultimate mystery and the ultimate revelation of Christmas is "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27; cf. the second stanza of "O Little Town of Bethlehem").

Burlington, Colo.

WALTER BARTLING

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS

2 COR. 1:3-20

Paul never celebrated the birth of the Son of God as we do in our times. The manner of celebrating Christmas is of late origin. Christmas as a Christian festival was not celebrated during the first three centuries after Christ. In fact, many of the practices connected with the celebration of Christ's birth have come from heathen customs. Examples.

However, Paul who never celebrated Christmas knew of the

blessings of Christmas. In our text, Paul speaks of some of these blessings which you and I enjoy because Christ was born. We may say that Paul knew the blessings we have

WHEN THE CHRIST OF CHRISTMAS COMES TO US

I

Then We Have Comfort

A. We have the comfort and consolation of the heavenly Father *for ourselves*. As Paul had suffered many things as a follower of Jesus and had enjoyed Christ's consolation, so we, too, have the same Father of mercies and God of comfort as we follow in the footsteps of Christ.

We also have this comfort *for others* in their troubles. Paul, who had learned the comfort of Jesus Christ, could comfort others. Christians today who have enjoyed God's comfort can comfort others.

B. We have this comfort in all tribulation and in any trouble, whether spiritual or temporal. No tribulation of the body is too small, no trouble of the soul is too big, for this comfort to console.

C. We have this comfort because Christ has come to live in our hearts. When the Christ of Christmas comes to live in our lives, we know the heavenly Father and with Him comfort.

II

Then We Have Deliverance

A. Paul cites his own example to show the Corinthians the deliverance he enjoyed in Christ (vv. 8-10). Paul in Asia was in so great danger that he had despaired of his life. We do not know to what event he refers. But in that danger Paul enjoyed deliverance.

B. By means of this example Paul teaches regarding the wondrous deliverance that comes with the knowledge of Jesus. Paul could look to the future, but he was not afraid. We can look to the end of the year and the beginning of another, but we are not alarmed. With the Christ of Christmas at our side, we are assured that our heavenly Father will deliver us from every evil work, yea, even from death, and will keep us unto the day of Jesus Christ.

C. We have this deliverance, not through trust in ourselves, but through trust in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have a sure deliverance because the historical Christ has come to live in our lives.

III

Then We Have a Good Conscience

A. One of the great joys is the testimony of a good conscience. The terror of an accusing conscience.

B. Paul had this joy of a good conscience (v. 12), even though some accused him of speaking and dealing deceitfully with the Corinthians. The accusation had arisen because Paul had written that he was planning to visit them before he went to Macedonia, but had to change his plans and had gone to Macedonia first.

C. Paul possessed this good conscience, "not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God." Enjoying this grace of God, he looked forward to the "day of Jesus Christ." This grace in Christ Jesus enabled him to have a good conscience.

D. When the Christ of Christmas comes into our lives, we can have the same good conscience by the grace of God, as we look forward to the day of the Lord Jesus.

IV

Then We Have Certainty

A. We live in a world of uncertainty. Paul's change of plans is a good example. We can plan, but we cannot be sure that our plans will be carried out. This will be true also in 1954.

B. In this uncertainty we can be sure that all of God's promises are Yea and Amen. Paul's plans may change, but the word of God written by Paul to the Corinthians cannot change. The Christ, the Son of God, preached by Paul, never changes. The promises of His forgiveness, His salvation, His righteousness, His care and protection, are Yea and Amen.

C. This certainty is based on Christ (v. 20). When the Christ of Christmas comes to us, we have this blessed certainty of God's Word and salvation in the future.

Take this Christ into your lives in ever greater degree. Keep Him in your hearts and lives during the new year.

Springfield, Ill.

LEWIS C. NIEMOELLER

BRIEF STUDIES

LUTHER AS A STUDENT OF HEBREW

(An essay read before the Sixth University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, Lexington, Ky., April 23—25, 1953, by Walter H. Koenig, pastor of St. Andrew's Lutheran Church, Sanborn, N. Y.)

In 1483, when Luther first saw the light of this world, the earliest dawning of Hebrew study among Christians had barely begun. In Jewish circles there was indeed some activity in the field of Hebrew grammar. In far away Lisbon, David ben Moses Iben Yahya (1440 to 1504) had just produced his *Leshon Limmudim* ("Tongue of Learners"), a concise grammar of the Hebrew language; and in Provence, Isaak ben Kalonymos had fathered *Meir Natib* ("Light of the Path"), the first concordance of the Hebrew Bible (1447).¹ In Italy, Hebrew books had been printed since 1475.² But in Christendom, Hebrew was a dead language except in the case of a few converted Jews. Charles Singer, after carefully surveying the entire medieval period, must confess: "Looking back on the history of the knowledge of Hebrew in the Middle Ages, one is struck by its excessive rarity. Despite the obvious importance of ascertaining the exact meaning of the words of Scripture, only four Latin Christians in the Middle Ages have left records which showed they attained to anything that can be called real Hebrew scholarship—a) the unknown translator of the thirteenth-century Latin Bible used by Robert Grosseteste, b) the unknown correspondent of Toulouse, c) Nicholas of Lyra, d) Paul of Burgos; and of these a) probably and d) certainly were converted Jews."³

In 1483 Nicholas of Lyra had been dead 140 years, Paul of Burgos 48. It would be three years before Pico della Mirandola would begin his study of Hebrew under Jochanan Alemanno—and nine before Johann Reuchlin would start learning Hebrew from Jakob Loans, the Emperor's Jewish physician. Five years it would be until Bologna University⁴ would found a chair in Hebrew, the first since Grosseteste's efforts to introduce Hebrew into Oxford had aborted around 1330.⁵ The general opinion was that of the unknown French monk quoted by Sismondi in his *History of France*: "A new language has been discovered called Greek. It should be carefully avoided, for it gives rise to heresy; as for the Hebrew language, anybody who learns it becomes a Jew."⁶

When Luther matriculated at the University of Erfurt in 1501, the

knowledge of Hebrew grammar was still bound up securely in grammatical works written in Hebrew or Arabic and "dependent upon the services of a good teacher, who was by no means easily found" (Box).⁷ Neither Luther nor the University of Erfurt, both entrenched in the *via antiqua*, were interested in Hebrew.⁸ In the *contubernum*, or fellowship, to which Luther—as well as the later humanist Crotus Rubianus—belonged, Scholastic philosophy was discussed, and Luther was known as "the philosopher."⁹

In 1505 Luther entered the monastery. Not until 1506 did Johann Reuchlin have his *De rudimentis Hebraicis* printed at Pforzheim.¹⁰ Now at least there was a Latin book from which Hebrew could be learned; but the sample page given in E. G. Schwiebert's *Luther and His Times*¹¹ shows how extremely difficult it must have been for a beginner without formal assistance to get much from its pages. Just when Luther came into contact with this book, from which, as he himself tells us,¹² he learned his first Hebrew, the sources have left unclear. Clear it is that as soon as Brother Martin had completed his novitiate, the powers that were in the Augustinian order of Germany decreed that Luther should return to his studies at Erfurt University.¹³ Here he soon felt some of the breezes of humanistic thought blowing over him, especially in his association with such fellow students as George Spalatin and Johann Lang,¹⁴ who, according to a letter quoted by Enders,¹⁵ assisted Luther not only in Greek but in Hebrew as well. In his exegetical courses he was introduced to the commentaries of Nicholas of Lyra and Paul of Burgos, and in the university library he could also read works of such humanists as Nicholaus Marshallk, Maternus, and Emser, all of whom had been formerly associated with Erfurt University. Already in his preparation for his initial lectures on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard in 1508, we see a thoroughly humanistic striving to get at the sources in his critical attempts to fix the true text of the good doctor.¹⁶

When Luther left Erfurt for Wittenberg, his Hebrew was still extremely rudimentary. He could read and pronounce the Hebrew characters well enough to make use of the lexical part of Reuchlin's textbook. But soon Luther had a much more urgent reason to study Hebrew. In September, 1512, the convention of his order in Germany, meeting at Cologne, decreed that Brother Martin should prepare to become a doctor of theology and take over the chair of theology at Wittenberg University, heretofore filled by the vicar general of the order in Germany, Johann von Staupitz, himself. He would now be oath and duty bound to expound both the New Testament and the

Old Testament faithfully. A year of careful, intense study followed this decision. Thilonius Philymnus, the Greek and Hebrew instructor at Wittenberg¹⁷—for Wittenberg had Hebrew since 1502—may have given him some help. Most of his time was given to a painstaking preparation for his forthcoming initial lectures on the Psalms. These he based on the Vulgate as given in Lefevre's scholarly *Psalterium Quintuplex* of 1509.¹⁸ Not until he neared the end of these first lectures (1513—1515) did Luther seriously doubt the inspiration and authority of the Vulgate text.¹⁹ At some time during these years Luther obtained his own copy of the Old Testament in Hebrew (the Brescia edition of 1494), which up to the time of the Second World War was still preserved in a Berlin museum.²⁰ Luther was also aided in his Hebrew studies by Reuchlin's new book for beginners published in 1512, which gave the seven penitential Psalms in Hebrew together with a word-for-word Latin translation and grammatical notes. Already in 1517,²¹ Luther published his translation of these Psalms in German—and, what is most significant, on the basis of the original Hebrew, thus, in the words of Bainton,²² "leaping beyond the tradition of a thousand years"; for all the 14 translations of the whole Bible into German, as well as the 22 of the Psalms and the 120 of various portions, appearing heretofore, had followed only the Vulgate.²³

In Luther's *Operationes in Psalmos* of 1519, compared with his notes of 1515, we notice the great progress which Luther made as an exegete and linguist in the midst of all his other work, although in his modesty he confesses in the introduction that Hebrew grammar "was not yet fully employed therein." But the Hebrew text was now always taken into consideration and the Septuagint at least occasionally.²⁴ The same progress we note also in the three major works of 1520.²⁵

But it was not so much from a study of Hebrew grammar as from direct reading of the Hebrew Bible itself that Luther's knowledge of the language derived. Once he himself said:²⁶ "I have learned more Hebrew in my own reading and comparing words and passages in the original than by going merely by the rules of grammar." And in this Luther was assisted immeasurably by his almost photographic memory, as displayed, for instance, in his memorable Leipzig debate in 1519, where the humanistically inclined Mosellanus marveled that he had such a knowledge of Greek and Hebrew at his finger tips.²⁷ It is certainly also striking evidence of Luther's familiarity with Biblical Hebrew as well as Greek that, on the way from the Diet of Worms, when he was "waylaid" near Castle Allenstein, he had ready at his side for this very emergency just two books to be snatched up at

a moment's notice, the two books that he wished to take with him into his "prison" on the Wartburg—his copy of Erasmus' Greek New Testament and his Hebrew Old Testament.²⁸ For weeks he had literally no other reading material, for at first he was kept hidden from the sight of all except the steward of the castle. Yes, in his "Patmos" he worked not only on the New but also on the Old Testament.²⁹ This is borne out by the incident at the Bear Inn on his way back to Wittenberg, as reported by John Kessler of St. Gall.³⁰ Marveling at the unknown knight's reading in a Hebrew book, he expressed the wish to be able to read Hebrew also. Luther (for it was he, as he later learned) answered, "I work hard at it every day."

Only if we remember this studiousness, can we understand how the first part of the German translation of the Old Testament containing the whole Pentateuch came out only a few months after the New Testament went to press.³¹ A few months more, and the second and third parts, containing the rest of the historical books and the Hagiographa, were before the world. Luther had been busy indeed on the Wartburg. 1523 and 1524 were as busy years as Luther had in all his busy life, as busy as 1525 and 1526. Yet not till 1526 did the next part, comprising only Jonah and Habakkuk, appear. In 1528 Zechariah and Isaiah, in 1529 Wisdom, in 1530 Daniel, and finally in 1532 all the Prophets appeared—followed in 1534 by the entire Bible, somewhat revised and printed in a single volume. Of course, he used all the best helps available in his work, as well as the assistance of his friends on the faculty of Wittenberg, especially Melancthon, who had learned Hebrew from his great-uncle, the great Reuchlin himself. There was also Aurogallus, who wrote a Hebrew grammar of his own in 1525,³² as well as Amsdorf, Jonas, Bugenhagen, Ziegler, Roerer, and later in the revisions, Cruciger (another Hebrew professor at Wittenberg) and Foerster (another pupil of Reuchlin). But it is certainly significant that Luther's main difficulty lay not in obtaining the sense of the Hebrew—he had an uncanny intuitive feeling for that, flowing from an inner sympathy for the Bible message and an inner rapport with the Hebrew temperament—but rather in forcing the Prophets to speak "the barbarous German."³³

Luther's method was certainly scholarly. After obtaining a literal rendering of the original in the word order of the original, he labored long and hard at rendering the sense of the Hebrew in idiomatic German.³⁴ His first editions were much stiffer in their literalness, the later ones smoother in their German.³⁵ And yet it was for the later editions especially that he made use of the help of his friends. Luther,

modest though he was, certainly was right in calling the entire Bible "his" work — and more especially the Hebrew scholarship it displayed was his. And that was of a high order. The judgment of H. G. Ganss is not overstating the case: "From the standpoint of philology, Luther's Bible translation is worthy of the highest commendation."³⁶ As a true scholar, Luther was never satisfied with his work, revising it again and again to the very year of his death. Not only has Luther's translation survived until the present, it has never been seriously challenged in German-speaking lands and has even become the basis of the German Catholic Bible³⁷ as well as the Dutch, Icelandic, Swedish, Danish, and to some extent of the versions of Tyndale and Coverdale.³⁸

Though Luther "showed his linguistic mastery primarily as translator of the Bible,"³⁹ his work as an exegete is also remarkable. Boehmer: "Even as an interpreter of Scripture, Luther achieved a great deal more than is usually ascribed to him. He is, if not the first, at least one of the first professors who in their work of expounding the Bible as a matter of principle followed the original text in natural grammatical and historical exegesis."⁴⁰ He also worked hard to stimulate the study of languages, also Hebrew. When Reuchlin was in difficulties with the Holy Office because of his advocacy of Hebrew learning, Luther wrote him a hearty letter of commendation.⁴¹ In the reorganization of Wittenberg University he had the Elector introduce a separate chair of Hebrew.⁴² In his famous *Letter to the Magistrates* he insisted on the necessity of Hebrew study for theologians.⁴³ He sought long and hard for suitable Hebrew instructors for Wittenberg and brought to the Elector's university such able scholars as Aurogallus, Cruciger, and Foerster.⁴⁴ One of his main criticisms of the theological training of the Bohemians was their omission of the study of Greek and Hebrew.⁴⁵ He insisted that every theological library should have its quota of books on Hebrew⁴⁶ and was unremitting in having Spalatin purchase the latest works also on Hebrew grammar. He himself studied these works to the end of his life, and, in addition, he gained information personally on Rabbinical literature and exegesis from Jew and proselyte alike.⁴⁷ This knowledge was especially reflected in works answering the attacks of Jewish writers on him and his writings. Mackinnon's judgment is that Luther can argue with the rabbis on linguistic questions — as on Is. 7:14 — on equal terms.⁴⁸ It is certainly remarkable that the very last polemical writing of the great Reformer, a tract against the Universities of Lyons, Cologne, and Paris, lay unfinished on his desk when he left on his final journey to Mansfield and his death, at a passage in which he described the three

universities by means of Hebrew homonyms of their names.⁴⁹ To the very end, Luther remained a student and master of the Hebrew tongue.

Luther was, of course, no Hebrew scholar like Reuchlin or Sebastian Muenster, Aurogallus or Foerster, Pagninus or Pellicanus, for these were interested primarily in the language as such, its grammar and lexical features. Luther's interest—also in Hebrew—was entirely practical. As far as he was concerned, it was intended by God to be a sharp sword in the hand of a fighter for the Lord and His truth. As such he mastered it, used it, and kept it ever bright. Luther is certainly an inspiring example for all who wish to acquire Hebrew as a tool for learning and teaching "what the Lord says." Like Erasmus,⁵⁰ he recommended the study of Hebrew highly; but, unlike Erasmus, he undertook the difficult task of actually acquiring it, literally lifting himself up in this endeavor "by his own bootstraps."⁵¹ T. M. Lindsay's judgment that "Luther never knew much Hebrew"⁵² is certainly a snap judgment that does not hold up under careful consideration of the sources. Luther was a true Hebrew scholar. We should have more such scholars today—also in our Lutheran Church.

In conclusion, it should not be forgotten that the Reformation as such provided a mighty impulse to the study of Hebrew generally.⁵³ As Burkitt points out,⁵⁴ Hebrew had been learned previous to Luther's day, even by a Reuchlin, primarily to discover the key of knowledge, which the Jews were believed to possess, especially in the cabala. With the Reformation it became imperative that all Christian theologians learn Hebrew as well as Greek in order to speak with finality on the basis of the original text and to proclaim with all assurance Jesus as Christ, Savior, Lord.⁵⁵

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Meyer Waxman, *History of Jewish Thought* (N. Y.: Bloch, 1933), II, 16, 17.
2. In Bevan-Singer (eds.), *The Legacy of Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), p. 313. The title of the essay in question, written by Charles Singer himself, is "Hebrew Scholarship in the Middle Ages Among Latin Christians."
3. Singer, *op. cit.*, p. 314.
4. Singer, *op. cit.*, p. 313.
5. "A tax of a farthing a pound on ecclesiastical goods was imposed in the province of Canterbury in 1320 for 'the stipend of the convert teaching the Hebrew tongue at Oxford.' 1325 a contribution of 17½d. was received by the abbot of Westminster out of the revenues of one of his churches 'for the expenses of the masters lecturing in the Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldean language at the University.' No other references have been found." (Singer, *ibid.*, p. 306.)

6. Quoted in Franz-Funk Brentano (trans., E. F. Buckley), *Luther* (London: Cape, 1936), p. 140.
7. G. H. Box, "Hebrew Study in the Reformation Period and After," in Bevan-Singer, p. 319. Hausrath, in *Aleander und Luther* (Berlin, 1897), speaks of Aleander's "ungewöhnliche Kenntnis des Hebräischen und Chaldäischen" (p. 9). Aleander lectured in Paris in 1508 in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, according to Box, *ibid.*, p. 341.
8. Robert H. Fife, *Young Luther* (N. Y.: Macmillan, 1928). "As late as 1514 Mutianus asserts in his gentle fashion that 'the apes of theology and the sophists dominate the whole school [Erfurt Univ.],' " p. 68.
9. James Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation* (London: Longmans, 1929), I, 26.
10. Kluepfel in *Herzog's Realencyklopaedie*, III, 756, sub "Reuchlin." The book sold at the rate of three copies for a *gulden* (about \$13.40 in terms of our 1913 currency), according to E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1950), p. 258. But Amerbach of Basel, who bought up the entire edition from Reuchlin, complained bitterly that he could find very few customers for the book.
11. Schwiebert, p. 279. The page pictured shows first a method of writing the Hebrew alphabet, and this is immediately followed by a paradigm showing the participle with pronominal endings, with no other explanation than that the forms are variations of פועל and פועלים respectively and that they should be studied.
12. In a letter to his friend Lang as cited by Fife, p. 146.
13. Mackinnon, III, 214 ff.
14. Both had been pupils of the humanist Nicolaus Marschalk. Cf. Schwiebert, pp. 281, 294, 296; also Fife, p. 146.
15. *Luthers Werke* (Weimar Ed.), *Briefe*, II, 548.
16. Fife, p. 69.
17. Schwiebert, p. 296.
18. Fife, p. 172.
19. Heinrich Boehmer, *Road to Reformation* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1946), p. 56.
20. Fritzsche in *Herzog's Realenc.*, III, sub "Deutsche Bibeluebersetzungen," p. 340.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 337, 338.
22. Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950), p. 326.
23. Franklin Gruber, "Wittenberg Originals of the Luther Bible" (in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society*, Vol. XII [Chicago U., 1912], 1; also Bruce, *Luther the Educator* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1928), p. 132.
24. Boehmer, p. 264.
25. Schwiebert, p. 281.
26. *Luthers Werke* (Erl. Ed.), LXII, 314.
27. Mackinnon, IV, 275.
28. Boehmer, p. 429.
29. Edwin P. Booth, *Martin Luther, Oak of Saxony* (N. Y.: Round Table Press, 1933), p. 165.
30. Franz-Funk Brentano, p. 146.

31. Gruber, pp. 2, 19. Freitag, in *Studien und Kritiken* (1927—1928), showed that Luther occasionally used Zainer's German Bible of 1475.
32. Seidemann, in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1875), on "Aurogallus."
33. "Mein Gott, welch eine grosze und mühsame Arbeit ist es doch, die hebräischen Schriftsteller gegen ihren Willen zum Deutschreden zu zwingen! Wie sträuben sie sich, ihr Hebräisches zu lassen und das barbarische Deutsch nachzuahmen, wie wenn man die Nachtigal zwingen wollte, den Kuckuck nachzuahmen!" So Luther complains in a letter to Link (June, 1528) quoted in Berger, *Martin Luther*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 641 (Berlin, 1919). Mackinnon (Vol. IV, 276) assures us: "He could, as a rule, make out the sense of the original without much difficulty," that is, the Hebrew Old Testament.
34. Bainton, p. 327.
35. Fritzsche, p. 338. Ps. 6:10 read in the first edition of 1524: "Got erhöret hat mein Gebet, Gott hat aufgenommen mein Bitten," while in the last edition of 1545 it read: "Der Herr höret mein Flehen, mein Gebet nimpt der Herr an."
36. *Catholic Encyclopedia* (N. Y.: Appleton, 1910), *Sub* "Luther."
37. Fritzsche, p. 345.
38. Gruber, p. 33.
39. Wilhelm Walther, "Luthers Deutsche Bibel," as quoted in Mackinnon, IV, 278.
40. Heinrich Boehmer, *Luther in the Light of Recent Research*, translated by Carl F. Huth, Jr. (New York, The Christian Herald, 1916).
41. This is found in Enders' *Briefe*, I, 321, 322. Hyma, in *Luther's Theological Development* (N. Y.: Crofts, 1928), translates it: "Those who have the cause of learning at heart have long wished for one like you. The Lord has achieved through you that the king of sophists may learn to be more slow and cautious in opposing sound theology. A German may breathe again through the teaching of Holy Scriptures, which, alas, for so many has been smothered and suppressed!"
42. Schwiebert, p. 299; Boehmer, *Road*, etc., p. 269.
43. This memorable tract is translated in full in F. V. N. Painter, *Luther on Education* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1928), p. 183 ff. The original is found in Weimar Edition, XV, 27 ff. A few quotations from this work show Luther's high esteem for Hebrew study. "In the first place, for the understanding of the Gospel, the study of Greek and Hebrew and other *artes liberales* is essential. . . . Germany will not long retain the Gospel without a knowledge of these languages — let there be no mistake about it. . . . They are the scabbard wherein the sword of the Spirit is sheathed, the shrine in which this treasure is hid. . . . How many errors disfigure the exegetical writings of Augustine, Hilary, and other Fathers who were ignorant of the original languages of Scripture! . . . While a preacher may preach Christ with edification though he may be unable to read the Scriptures in the originals, he cannot expound or maintain their teaching against the heretics without this indispensable knowledge. . . . It is so much more sin and shame that we do not learn the languages, especially since now God offers and gives us people and books and all other things which serve that end."
44. Schwiebert, p. 296.
45. *Luthers Werke* (Weimar Ed.), XI, 455, "Von Anbeten des Sakraments" (April, 1523).

46. Cf. Painter, p. 207.
47. Boehmer, "Luther in Light," etc., p. 181.
48. Luther, *Dasz Jesus Christus ein Geborener Jude war, Die Juden und Ihre Luegen*, and the calmer *Die Letzten Worte Davids*. Mackinnon's judgment, IV, 194.
49. Georg Buchwald, *Dr. Martin Luthers Letzte Streitschrift* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1893), pp. 6, 12.
50. Erasmus, *Novum Instrumentum* (1516), as quoted in Box, p. 318: "A fair knowledge of the three languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, is of course the first thing. Nor let the student turn away in despair at the difficulty of that. If you have a teacher and the will, these three languages can be learned with hardly more labor than is spent over the miserable babble of one mongrel language under ignorant teachers." Box adds the interesting comment: "It is certainly strange that, despite this explicit avowal, Erasmus himself made no serious attempt to acquire Hebrew."
51. Boehmer, "Luther in Light," etc., p. 94.
52. T. M. Lindsay, "The Reformation" in *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. II, p. 119. Cf. also Henry E. Jacobs, *Martin Luther* (N. Y.: Putnam, 1898), who three times in his short biography confesses to Luther's inadequate Hebrew knowledge (pp. 105, 208, 225). So also Berger, II, 64: "At the Wartburg, Luther would have liked to start at the beginning of the Bible, but he dared not risk it without the help of his Wittenberg friends." Much more sympathetic is the judgment of Robert Montgomery in his long epic poem "Luther" (London, 1842):

*There was the Word almighty, from the grave
 Of ancient language into modern life
 Summoned, in saintly glory to arise,
 And spoke to souls what souls could understand.
 Oh, to have seen him in the toil august,
 Lifting to heaven his bright, large, burning eyes
 With radiant wonder, as the depths of truth
 Eternal gave their hoary secrets up,
 When God's own language into Luther's passed.*
53. Jebb, in *Cambridge Modern History*, I, p. 343, puts it well: "Whatever else the Reformation meant, it greatly stimulated Biblical study. The diffusion of the Scripture in vernacular versions based upon the Hebrew and Greek originals were [sic] immensely developed by the Reformation. Hebrew study and Hebrew scholarship came to play an all-important part."
54. F. C. Burkitt, "Debt of Christianity to Judaism," in Bevan-Singer, p. 94.
55. Luther once said: "When we go to the sources, we are led to Christ."

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

EITHER BULTMANN OR THE BIBLE

Among the most recent critiques of Rudolf Bultmann's theology is the following manifesto which a German pastor recently sent us. It will be noted that the author, in contradistinction to most other critics, attacks Bultmann's theology at its most vulnerable point. Our translation of the German text reads:

THE BIBLE IS AT STAKE

AN APPEAL TO ALL BIBLE-BELIEVING GROUPS IN OUR EVANGELICAL CHURCH

Our evangelical Church is in danger! From without, sects are attacking it in a way in which they have never before attacked it. From within, a new form of theology is undermining the foundation on which alone the Church can stand. In our day our evangelical Church resembles a besieged city which is threatened from without by enemies attacking it from all directions; and, from within, by the convulsions of the foundations caused by men who, in view of their calling as teachers of theology, ought to defend these foundations. Because of this crisis, Bible-believing groups in our evangelical Church may no longer be silent. The undersigned members of the Church are therefore approaching all those who are truly concerned that God's Word must not be placed under a bushel, with the earnest petition:

Be silent no longer in view of the serious danger threatening our Church. Confer with us — and, above all, pray with us that God may preserve for His Church His pure Word.

What is it that is at stake? Professor Bultmann, for decades (until his voluntary retirement this summer) incumbent of a chair of theology at the University of Marburg, has within recent years caused incalculable confusion among young theologians through his book *Die Entmythologisierung des Neuen Testaments*. Professor Bultmann aims to "demythologize" the entire Bible, that is, he wants to free it from all "myths" (he also uses the term "legends"). What the Bible reveals to us as the most central facts of salvation are for Bultmann myth and legend. Therefore he can say:

"Done for is the legend of the Virgin Birth!

"Done for is the belief that Jesus is God's only-begotten Son!

"Done for are the miracles of the New Testament!

"Done for is the belief in spirits and demons!

"Done for is the story of the descent into hell!

"Done for is the resurrection of Jesus Christ as a real and historical event!

"Done for is the story of the ascension of Christ!

"Done for is 'mythical eschatology,' that is, belief in the return of Christ!

"Done for is the belief in a real and true resurrection!

"Done for is the belief in a new heaven and a new earth where there will be no more death!"

What remains after such a "demythologizing" process? Nothing but a heap of ruins of human philosophy, as a Bible-believing teacher of our Church has termed it. What makes matters worse is that we are not dealing with the private opinion of a scholar, but with a poison which is seeping into the hearts of young theologians and is destroying the faith of many who plan at some time to stand in the pulpits of our churches charged with the commission to preach to us the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In view of this situation, there remains for Bible-believing groups in our Church nothing but an inescapable *either — or*.

1. *Either* the Bible is the Word of God, and if it is, then this Word has the right to address me with its demands and to expect me to listen to, and to act on, these demands; then my reason must be silent and must bow before the Word in an attitude of prayer. —

Or the Bible is not the Word of God, but merely *contains* the Word of God, which, like gold, is hidden away under valueless clinkers. Then I must call on my reason for counsel and inquire which parts of the Bible are genuine and which are not genuine. Pity the Church in which man's reason sits in judgment over God's Word!

2. *Either* the Apostle is right when he writes 2 Tim. 3:16: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (Adolf Schlatter translates still more distinctly: "Every Bible passage stems from God's Spirit"), *or* the Apostle Paul erred, and Professor Bultmann is right.

3. *Either* our assurance of faith rests on the Word, which "holy men of God" present to us in the Bible, as the Apostle Peter declares: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter 1:21) —

Or we must determine in our day which parts of Scripture the Holy Ghost inspired and which parts He did not inspire.

4. *Either* such introductory statements in the Bible, as "Thus saith the Lord . . .," "And God said . . .," "Jesus said . . .," "The Holy Ghost saith . . .," etc., are true —

Or they are true only in instances, and the critic of the Bible has the duty to eliminate from the Bible what is not inspired and to

piece together the remainder. Pity the Church which is expected to live by such a tailor-made Gospel! It will hunger and not have the Bread of Life. It will thirst and not find the Water of Life.

This is the crisis in which our evangelical Church finds itself in our day. In all evangelical theological faculties in Germany the opinion is held and taught that the Word of the Bible is indeed called the Word of God, but in the sense that it is the Word of God mixed with the word of man. Hence we can no longer tolerate it that men enter the ministry who do not believe in the inspiration of the entire Bible. Whoever denies the inspiration of the entire Bible denies also the final authority of the Bible. The "scientific" insights of a given generation, which have often been proved to be false, are accorded greater credence in our day than the Bible. In our day man's reason is the norm and determining authority and not the divine Spirit's guidance and enlightenment. If our future pastors are pledged on the Apostolic confession of the faith of our fathers, then they cannot, at the same time, conduct their office in the spirit of modern Bible criticism. We are reproducing a "demythologized" confession of faith, namely, the Second Article of the Apostolic Creed:

I believe in Jesus Christ,

~~His only Son,~~

Our Lord:

~~Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,~~

~~Born of the Virgin Mary,~~

Suffered under Pontius Pilate,

Was crucified, dead, and buried;

~~He descended into hell,~~

~~The third day He rose again from the dead;~~

~~He ascended into heaven,~~

~~And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;~~

~~From thence He shall come again—~~

~~To judge the quick and the dead—~~

Our conclusion is: It is utterly impossible for the Church of Jesus Christ to tolerate in its midst servants of the Word who deny the decisive saving facts of the Word of God. Something must be done to change this!

Comments on the above critique seem unnecessary.

P. M. B.

"WE ALSO BELIEVE AND THEREFORE SPEAK" (2 Cor. 4:13)

It was faith in the truth of God's revelation in Christ which moved Paul and his collaborators to confess that faith and to oppose all objections to that faith raised by the erring judgments of men. It was that same faith which moved Martin Luther and his collaborators and

followers to protest against errors in the Church and to confess the truth of God's holy Word. It was that same faith which, in recent months, moved individual Lutherans in Germany to issue and to circulate in the regional Lutheran churches (*Landeskirchen*) of Germany a declaration which we are appending below.

By way of explanation, a few words seem appropriate. The Evangelical Church of Germany (EKiD) was organized in 1948. It was ostensibly organized as a federation and declared itself to be such in its constitution. Its member churches are primarily Lutheran, Reformed, and Union ("uniert"). At the time of its organization and since that time the official name of the Federation has been under fire, since, according to its constitution, the organization is a *federation* and not a *Church*. Though the Evangelical Church of Germany has repeatedly disavowed the charge that it functions as a *Church*, it has not been able to allay the suspicion that it is *de facto* a *Church* and that its ultimate aim is to bring about a united Church of Germany in which all confessions may find refuge and in which they will, in course of time, forget their confessional differences. In the light of this explanation the following "declaration" is of more than passing significance. It reads:

DECLARATION

1. I believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament are the revealed Word of God and the only norm of the Church's doctrine and life. Therefore I shall, in the execution of my office, submit to this only norm in the doctrine which I proclaim and in the administration of the Sacraments.

2. I am aware that I have pledged myself to the confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, including the doctrinal decisions of the Formula of Concord, *because* they are the correct interpretation of Holy Scripture. I endeavor, through continuous study, to penetrate more deeply into the theological statements of the confessional writings and to teach and to administer the Sacraments accordingly.

3. Because I am pledged to the Lutheran Confessions, I must demand that only such persons preach in the pulpits of Evangelical Lutheran churches and administer and/or receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at their altars who are committed to this platform (statements 1 and 2 above) and who are members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

4. I favor conferences with brethren of other confessions and collaboration with Christians and churches of other confessions, with the proviso that through such contacts the truth is not compromised.

But I object to the functioning of the Evangelical Church of Germany (EKiD) as a Church. I also object to the term "Church," which appears in the official name of this body. I also disavow the ambiguous directives in the constitution of the Evangelical Church of Germany which allow for an interpretation in violation of the Lutheran Confessions. Therefore I demand that these directives be changed in order that the character of the Evangelical Church of Germany as a *federation* of differing confessions be unmistakably clear.

5. I shall, in a spiritual manner, support all those who act according to this declaration. Whoever finds himself in difficulties because he acts in conformity with this declaration should be assured that I will stand by him in word and deed as soon as the administration of the *Lutherischer Bruderkreis*, of the *Gesellschaft für Innere und Aeusserer Mission im Sinne der Lutherischen Kirche*, and of the *Martin-Luther-Verein, Evang. Luth. Diasporadienst in Bayern*, calls upon me to do so.

Almost prophetically, one might say, Dr. Hans Asmussen, widely known Lutheran theologian in Germany, wrote in April, 1948, a few weeks before the Evangelical Church of Germany was born: "Even though at this moment things do not look very bright, I am not discouraged. For we must pass through this stage *in order that those who are Lutherans might become truly awake*" (italics my own). We trust and pray that many disturbed Lutherans in the regional Lutheran churches of Germany will, as a result of EKiD's history in the past five years, "become truly awake" and that God will bless their witness. In response to Dr. Asmussen's observation in 1948, Dr. J. W. Behnken wrote at the time: "All these developments will help us to understand that we have a tremendous obligation in attempting to get the *Pfarrer* and other leaders in Germany to realize how important it is that they return to sound confessional Lutheranism. May God graciously bless the loyal insistence upon His truth!" The results of the Bad Boll conferences in Germany since 1948 have more than justified the truth and timeliness of Dr. Behnken's observation.

P. M. B.

1853 — CENTENNIAL OF IMMIGRANT SERVICE — 1953

Under this title, George W. E. Nickelsburg, in the *American Lutheran* (May, 1953), presents a brief overview of Synod's immigrant work, especially in the early period of our Church. He begins with the thought that those who contribute toward the Free Tract Fund of the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau continue the work of the founders of the Immigrant Mission, who spread free tracts among the German

immigrants and so directed them to our Church. The immigrant mission work of our Church is, as the writer states, largely the outgrowth of the fervor of Candidate Theodore Julius Brohm of Dresden, Germany, who joined the 1839 Saxon Immigration to St. Louis, Mo. In 1843 he was called to the pastorate of Trinity Church in New York City. When in 1847 the State of New York established its Immigration Commission, Pastor Brohm volunteered to contact in some measure the thousands of immigrants fleeing Germany as a result of the German Revolution of 1848. Together with two of Trinity's laymen, J. H. Bergmann and Joachim Birkner, he organized an unofficial immigrant committee. In 1851 Synod at Milwaukee turned down Pastor Brohm's plea for official recognition of the immigrant cause. At the Cleveland convention in 1853 Synod considered "the enterprising brethren as a committee of Synod." In 1872 the St. Louis convention was memorialized by the Eastern District to establish immigrant work at Baltimore, which began that year. In 1869 Rev. Stephanus Keyl was called as the first full-time immigrant missionary of Synod by the New York Pastoral Conference. The scene which greeted him was pathetic. The Immigrant Mission Board soon reported that the need, the helplessness, and the perplexity of the immigrants were so great that "here is a field which bids for deeds of Christian love and mercy as hardly any other." It was suggested to Pastor Keyl that he should make reports of the needs through the pages of *Der Lutheraner*. This he did so effectively that in 1878 Synod heard no lengthy report of its immigrant work, but declared that "everyone can trace a true picture of the importance and difficulty of the work from these reports." The work of the immigrant missionaries consisted largely in the distribution of tracts. In 1874, at the first delegate (national) convention at Fort Wayne, it was reported that 52,869 tracts and over 5,000 calendars had been distributed gratis. In addition, Pastor Keyl enclosed Scripture-text cards in 2,640 letters to the friends and relatives of potential immigrants. The successor of Pastor Keyl was the Rev. H. Restin, who carried on the splendid work after his predecessor's death in 1905. Meanwhile in 1885 Synod had purchased the *Pilgerhaus* at 8 State Street because of the increasingly heavy demands of the work. Missionary Restin, too, distributed tracts to Lutherans and non-Lutherans whenever he went to Ellis Island. The tract distribution work is now being conducted by the Rev. W. M. Stieve from offices at 422 West 44th St., New York City. One of the immigrants won for our Church was Henry W. Horst, who went west and built himself a one-room house on the Kansas prairie. His leadership in our Church in later years is well known.

J. T. MUELLER

DR. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY TO RETIRE

According to a report in the *Presbyterian Guardian*, Dr. C. E. Macartney, for 26 years pastor of First Presbyterian (U.S.A.) Church, Pittsburgh, retired on July 1 of this year. He was then 73 years old. Dr. Macartney is widely known as a preacher and writer. A graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, he became prominent in conservative Presbyterian circles as the author of the famous overture (1922—23) against Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's Modernism. This overture, adopted in substance by the 1923 General Assembly, along with a declaration concerning "essential doctrines," was followed by the Modernist reply, *The Auburn Affirmation*, the next year. In that year Dr. Macartney was elected Moderator of the General Assembly. A member of the Board of Directors of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Macartney opposed the reorganization of that seminary's administration in 1929 and joined others in planning and establishing Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia. He served as a member of Westminster's Board of Directors until 1936. When it became apparent that the movement headed by Dr. Machen would be compelled to separate from the Presbyterian denomination, Dr. Macartney and several other members of the Board, together with one member of the faculty, resigned. In 1936 Dr. Machen was suspended. With others he then organized the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Dr. Macartney denounced the action of the Assembly against Dr. Machen, but chose to remain in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. He never married, just as also Dr. Machen was never married. Dr. Macartney will devote his leisure chiefly to writing. His retirement reminds one of the thirty years' struggle between conservatism and liberalism in the Presbyterian Church.

J. T. MUELLER

YEARBOOK OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY BETHEL

Who has not heard of the v. Bodelschwingh institutions called Bethel, located near Bielefeld in northwestern Germany! Among the various noteworthy enterprises conducted successfully in that place is a theological seminary which serves the Church of Westphalia; it has the simple title *Theologische Schule Bethel*. The school at present is staffed with ten teachers. In 1952 the faculty issued a yearbook which has the significant title *Wort und Dienst*. It is dedicated to one of the professors, Dr. H. Girgensohn, whose 65th birthday was thereby observed in a dignified manner. The yearbook is more than a report on the work done by the school during the two years (1950—52) it covers. It contains a number of essays written by members of the faculty pertaining to the speciality of the respective authors. The list of these

papers will be read with interest: *Das Sintflutgebet in der Taufsiturgie* (Alfred Adam); *Wicherns Ringen mit den sozialen Problemen seiner Zeit* (Wilhelm Brandt); *Vom Psalmenbeten* (Johannes Fichtner); *Geist und Amt* (Gerhard Friedrich); "Wer unter euch . . . ?" (a study of certain parables, by Heinrich Greeven); *Zu Hebraeer 2, Vers 10* (Helmut Kraemer); *Das achte Gebot—Exod. 20, Vers 16* (Hans Joachim Stoebe); *Arbeit und Beruf in christlichem Verstaendnis* (Hans Heinrich Wolf). The chief theological contribution of the volume is an opinion of the whole faculty entitled *Stellungnahme zu der von Prof. D. Bultmann vertretenen "Entmythologisierung."* The final pages of the volume are devoted to a report on the work done by the school 1950—52. Altogether it is a rich repast which is here offered to the theological world.

WILLIAM F. ARNDT

BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

The second Scandinavian Roman Catholic diocese since the Reformation has been established in Norway. A Vatican announcement said that Pope Pius XII, had elevated the Vicariate-Apostolic of Oslo to be a diocese, with Bishop James Mangers, presently Vicar-Apostolic of Oslo, as first head of the see. Catholics in Norway number some 5,000 in a total population of 3,000,000. . . . In May the Vicariate-Apostolic of Denmark was raised to a diocese, with Copenhagen as the see city. That was the first Catholic diocese to be established in Scandinavia since the 16th century.

* * *

The Mongolian "Praesidium of the Great People's Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic," one of the 16 republics in the Soviet Union, issued an amnesty decree for various classes of prisoners who were thereupon released from jail; but the amnesty specifically excluded "persons convicted for counter-revolutionary activity, banditry, squandering of public property, premeditated murder, for the propagation of religion of any kind and religious superstitions for the masses, and rape."

* * *

At a meeting of clergymen and Chamber of Commerce members in the twin towns of Cutler and Orosi, Calif., for the purpose of promoting civic harmony and good will a Methodist church worker, the Rev. Irene Swinney, emphasized the need for strengthening family unity as a foundation for sound community life. She made the statement that "the church is as guilty as any other institution, since it takes the father away one night, the mother another, singing members

another, and the children some other time, so that the family is often separated and has very little time together."—It is perhaps well that this point be remembered; at the same time anyone who knows life as it is lived today knows that there are other modern institutions which are far more the cause of separating the family than the church.

* * *

In a meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, on August 14, the Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America decided to change the name of the organization to American Evangelical Lutheran Church. As reason for the change it was stated that "more and more of our members have nationality backgrounds other than Danish."

* * *

A thousand delegates of the Gideons International, assembled in Seattle, Wash., were told that the organization distributed more than 2,250,000 Bibles and Testaments during the past year, all but 300,000 of which were given out at Armed Forces induction centers, hotels, hospitals, and other public places in the U. S. A.

* * *

The Department of Commerce in Washington, D. C., reported that contributions to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools set an all-time record last year. These schools, most of which are parochial schools, received \$734,000,000, against \$652,000,000 in 1951 and \$498,000,000 in 1949. The figures indicate a great increase in support for religious schools in the last four years.

* * *

The German Luther Association has been reactivated in Hamburg, Germany, after a 14-year interruption. Founded at Wittenberg on Reformation Day in 1918 to promote "knowledge and understanding of Martin Luther and his works," the association suspended activities at the beginning of World War II. Dr. Paul Althaus of Erlangen University, who was president of the organization since 1927, continues as head of the reactivated group.

* * *

The 250th anniversary of the early ordination of a Lutheran minister in America was commemorated at Yale University's Battell Chapel in New Haven, Conn., during the annual convention of the United

Lutheran Synod of New York and New England. Dr. Abdel Ross Wentz of Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., a leading historian of American Lutheranism, preached the sermon. He recounted the story of the ordination of the Rev. Justus Falckner at Philadelphia on November 24, 1703. The son of a German Lutheran minister at Halle, Saxony, Falckner was ordained by a Swedish Lutheran to serve a parish comprising 14 congregations of Dutch-American Lutherans in a territory extending from Manhattan Island north to Albany, N. Y., and west to New Jersey's Raritan Valley.

* * *

The article of Norway's constitution banning Jesuits from the land still stands. A constitutional amendment repealing this article has been shelved by the Parliament and will not be on the agenda again before January, 1955.

* * *

East Germany's Communist government has unexpectedly restored ownership of Mansfeld Castle, near Eisleben, Saxony, to the Lutheran Church. In the peace pact with the Evangelical Church leaders signed in Berlin in June Mansfeld Castle had been specifically excepted when Soviet Zone officials agreed to return confiscated church property.

* * *

It is reported from Trieste that local Communist committees in Czechoslovakia have been ordered to confiscate organs from churches. The pretext given is that the organs are needed for the entertainment of the workers.

* * *

Much comment and criticism has been caused by the publication of Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey's *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Dr. Kinsey is professor at Indiana University, and Archbishop Paul C. Schulte of Indianapolis said: "Every self-respecting Hoosier must profoundly regret the notoriety Dr. Alfred Kinsey has brought to our renowned Indiana University." It is not so much the report itself that is criticized, but the cheap publicity given to it. Said the Archbishop: "There can be no valid objection to a scientific investigation of sexual behavior that would assist lawmakers, educators, clergymen, physicians, and other professional people dedicated to the task of preserving and promoting the spiritual, mental, and physical well-being of society. But Dr. Kinsey has degraded science. Instead of circulating the findings of his investigations among those competent to weigh their worth and apply them to the betterment of mankind, he publicizes them, like a cheap charlatan, and in the most unscientific fashion makes them

available to the young, the unlearned, the mentally deficient — to their own great harm and the endangering of society." The *Indiana Catholic and Record* declared: "The harm that can result from the sensational popularizing of the Kinsey Report is really alarming." The promotion given the Kinsey Report "is perhaps the most evil thing about it," said the Rev. Leonard Cowley, pastor of St. Olaf's Catholic Church and chaplain of the Newman foundation at the University of Minnesota. "There is a danger that the report will arouse the curiosity of young people without giving necessary information. Young people may come to believe from statements in the book that certain sexual practices are more widespread than they really are and that if they do them, they are not deviating so much from normal behavior." "Kinsey's book is probably the most overplayed thing that has ever been published," said Dr. Dwight E. Loder of Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church in Minneapolis. "It doesn't carry as much significance as it has been given." In an investigation whether the book should be banned as "obscene, lewd, and immoral literature," Bernard J. Berry, Jersey City, N. J., public safety director, said: "It is far from representative of the right-thinking women of Jersey City and this nation. On the basis of interviews with a few thousand women it pretends to legislate morality for 80,000,000 American women." Dr. W. Alfred Diman, executive secretary of the Chicago Baptist Convention, warned that "the general public is likely to make the dangerous and incorrect assumption that Dr. Kinsey's statistics are representative of American women on a national level. I believe the fact that the women interviewed would answer such questions sheds some light on the type of women interviewed." And Evangelist Billy Graham: "It is an indictment of American womanhood of the lowest sort, because only a woman of the lowest sort would answer questions asked by a man about her most intimate life."

* * *

An extensive report was made to the meeting of the Lutheran Welfare Conference of America and the Associated Lutheran Charities by the Rev. Paul Hansen, director of the Family Research Project of the Missouri Synod. He told them that religious influence was the greatest deterrent to divorce at a time "when marriages are being entered into for better or worse, but not for good." The divorce rate among U.S. Lutherans, he reported, is far below the national average. The Family Research Project included surveys of families in the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Augustana Lutheran Church as well as Missouri Synod members. The survey revealed that "the Lutheran Church can

point to a record of only one divorce for every 20 marriages instead of the national average of one in four, or even three, and the general Protestant average of one divorce in 10 marriages. "But," he added, "we must admit that a rising divorce rate indicates some weakness in our Church's program." He suggested that the Church might be adding to family tensions by failing to understand what problems really were disturbing American families. According to the survey, laymen agreed that the worst common causes of family disagreement were, in order of their importance, finances, in-laws, and child training. But the pastors "missed all three causes of conflict" and named drink, sex, and religion as the main causes of family conflict. Lutheran writings on divorce and remarriage have shown remarkable consistency, but "Lutheran practice has often been bewildering in its variety." "Divorce may be the only answer at times, but there needs to be a more clearly defined policy by which both family and counselor can arrive at the will of God in each instance." 86 per cent of pastors questioned in the survey favored thorough sex education for young people; but the Church has been "missing fine opportunities" to give sex education in confirmation classes, Sunday schools and, in many cases, parochial schools.

* * *

Under the heading "Catholic Protest Brings Revision in County History," RNS reports from Easton, Pa.: Two passages in a new history of Northampton County which was to be used as a text in the 9th and 10th grades of county schools were changed because of protests that they reflected unfavorably on Roman Catholics. The first passage referred to the reasons for Moravian migration to America. It read: "Numerous people in this area, as in other scattered areas throughout Europe, had for some years shown dissatisfaction with corrupt features of the Roman Catholic Church." The other passage questioned was: "Slum conditions frequently developed where large numbers of immigrants settled. Criminals and undesirables of all shades were among them. They were predominantly Roman Catholic in religion coming into a Protestant area, and in larger cities they came to be controlled by political bosses." By a vote of three to two a committee of the Northampton County Historical and Genealogical Society recommended revisions; the first passage to read: "Numerous people in this area, as in other scattered areas throughout Europe, had for some years shown signs of breaking away from the Roman Catholic Church"; the other: "Slum conditions frequently developed where numbers of

immigrants settled. In the big cities they came to be controlled by political bosses. As is usual in any large, unregulated immigration, there were criminals among them. Opposition to this unchecked flow from abroad became bitter. Fears were expressed that the newcomers would outnumber the native-born Americans and that they would soon control the country. Most of them were Roman Catholics, and this, *in the case of certain elements of the Protestant population* [italics mine], added to the resentment against them." — It was evidently taken for granted that Protestants have a thicker skin than the others! And history students in Easton (if any) seem to have been satisfied with the explanation of the two dissenting committee members: "A tempest in a teapot." — A pertinent remark of the Presbyterian Guardian: "History is supposed to be a record of what happened. However, many writers of history have discovered that it is practically impossible to record facts without also interpreting those facts. But if, as a result, history must be written to satisfy all those who may be involved in it, we shall soon cease to have any such thing as history at all. Roman Catholicism has many dark pages in its past. Forcing the rewriting of history books will not change history. Some people would like to rewrite the early chapters of the Bible. But what has happened cannot be changed."

* * *

Dr. John A. Mackay, newly elected moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., warned that detestation of Communism has produced a "new form of idolatry" in this country. Anti-Communist fervor has in effect become a substitute religion. "A passionate, unreflective opposition to the Communist demon is coming to be regarded as the one and only true expression of Americanism and even of Christianity. It is proper to abhor Communism; let there be no mistake about that. But the spirit to which I refer, this new cult of negation, is something quite different. It is a form of idolatry, which, as always happens in idolatrous attitudes, engenders fanaticism. Fanaticism is a mood of the human spirit which glorifies feeling. It stifles thought; it rejects the formulation of questions requiring calm reflection. The reason is obvious. Any appeal to thought might diminish the white heat of passion in which the devotees of the new cult desire to live. . . . The only way in which men can be saved from the pressure of false absolutes, whether they be negations or affirmations, is that they be summoned to the one ultimate loyalty, which is the recognition and service of the Living God."

THEO. HOYER

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW. By G. E. P. Cox. SCM Press, London (Macmillan, New York). 168 pp., 5×7½. \$2.00.

This commentary is one in a series known as the Torch Commentaries. This is a set worth knowing. The authors of the volumes in the Torch series do not follow the usual pattern of commentators. They seek to present in a very concentrated form the essence of each book of the Scriptures. The aim of the whole series is to provide the general reader with the soundest possible assistance in understanding the message of each book considered as a whole and as a part of the Bible. The set is worth recommending particularly to very busy pastors.

This particular volume on St. Matthew is done by the chaplain and lecturer in divinity at St. Katharine's College in Liverpool. Mr. Cox uses the traditional division of the Gospel into five books. In fact, he takes this division as the framework for his exegesis. He sees the structure of the Gospel as a prolog followed by a central section in which we find "five great discourses of Jesus' teaching preceded by narratives skillfully adjusted to introduce them." The message of the whole Gospel reaches its climax and is summarized in an epilog which sets forth the story of the Passion and resurrection of Jesus and His commission to the Church to preach the Gospel to all mankind.

Mr. Cox devotes a minimum of space to the question of authorship and of synoptic sources. Although we cannot fully agree with the results of his work, he presents his materials very succinctly and very effectively. He is to be commended for not going into greater detail; for this whole area is full of speculation and hypothesis. The distinction between the words and works of Jesus is highly debatable. Gerhard Kittel once said it is impossible to separate these two. Mr. Cox makes every effort at being scholarly and of using the results of modern Biblical theology.

Perhaps what he says on page 34 in connection with the Virgin Birth can give us the measure of this book. There he says: "It is important that at this time of day we do not simply reject it [the Virgin Birth] on supposedly scientific grounds as contravening 'laws of nature.' Natural science no longer makes confident claims for the immutability of the natural order as did a generation or two ago. The universe is no longer regarded as a 'closed system' in which no external interference is possible, nor are the 'laws' of nature regarded as other than empirical and incomplete formu-

lations of her normal modes of behavior. Too many 'impossibilities' have become very real facts in recent years for men to lay down with confidence the limits of the possible. . . . This is doubtless a 'miracle,' but without it, as agnostics have acknowledged, the greater miracle of the personal sinlessness and the unclouded moral and spiritual insight of Jesus, overcoming from the beginning the universal human tendency to err, becomes even more inexplicable than it is."

It may also be of some interest to present very briefly what this commentator says on Matt. 16:18. This paragraph is found on page 110. It reads as follows: "The basic idea is doubtless that of Isaiah 28:16. There is, however, an ancient midrash or 'edifying religious story' based on Deuteronomy 21 which describes how when God sought to create the world, foreseeing the faithful Abraham, he said, 'Now I have found a rock (*petra*) on which to build and establish the world' (cf. Is. 51:1,2). Similarly, Peter is said to be the foundation rock of the new Israel."

Of three possible interpretations of the phrase, "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Mr. Cox prefers the one which describes the keys as "the symbol of unlimited authority in the royal household." He does admit, however, that there are two other possible interpretations. One of them might find a parallel in Rev. 1:18, where Christ holds the keys of hell and of death. The other interpretation is based on an analogy with Luke 11:52. According to this interpretation, Peter opens the kingdom of heaven to others by his knowledge and insight into its mystery, which he makes plain.

Mr. Cox does not interpret Matt. 16:18, 19 in such a way as to describe the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. He is quick to note that the authority and disciplinary powers granted to Peter were to be shared by the other Apostles. On page 113 he dismisses the whole question of the Papacy in this one sentence: "The question of Peter's successors is a matter which, whatever its merits, can hardly be said to stand upon the witness of Scripture alone."

All in all, this is a rather thoroughgoing commentary, which has much to recommend it. It is readable and interesting. It is not cluttered up with any footnotes or lengthy discussions on individual words or other details. It proposes to present the essence of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. In that task Mr. Cox succeeds admirably.

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

DR. MARTIN LUTHERS EVANGELIENAUSLEGUNG. By Erwin Mülhaupt (ed.). Five volumes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938 to 1953.

The several volumes are:

- I. *Die Vor- und Weihnachtsgeschichte bei Matthäus und Lukas.* Second ed., 1952. 304 pages. 23.80 DM.
- II. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium.* Second ed., 1948. 872 pages. 48 DM.

III. *Das Markus- und Lukas-Evangelium*. The last of the three fascicles appeared this summer. Price of bound volume about 30 DM.

IV. *Das Johannes-Evangelium*. All fascicles have now appeared. Price of bound volume about 35 DM.

V. *Die Passions- und Ostergeschichte*. 1950. 484 pages. 37.50 DM.

The publication of this work is a theological event of primary importance. For the first time a devoted student of Luther's works undertook the huge task of assembling from *all* of Luther's diverse published writings those passages in which Luther interprets the sacred text of the Four Gospels, of weaving these passages together, and of therefore giving us a running commentary on the four Gospels by Martin Luther. Though Luther published commentaries on some Old and New Testament books, he did not publish a commentary on any one of the Four Gospels. Nevertheless he expounded the Gospel pericopes in his sermons, published interpretations of the Lord's Prayer, the Magnificat, the Sermon on the Mount, the discourses in St. John's Gospel, etc., and in his devotional, polemical, political, and reformatory writings gave his interpretation of many passages in the Four Gospels. After twenty years of most patient and laborious investigation, Erwin Mülhaupt and his associates have, a few months ago, published the last fascicles so that by now all five bound volumes ought be available.

The editors proceed as follows: Scripture passage(s) in Luther's original translation; brief but meaningful heading by the editor; reference(s) to sources in Luther's works; Luther's exposition (in current standard German). Sometimes Luther's interpretation of a brief passage covers several pages; sometimes he apparently has nothing to say on a given passage. A well-done table of contents and a composite list of references conclude each volume.

This work is a *must* for the preacher who is eager to know Luther's thought on a given passage in the Gospels. In this work, Luther the preacher, the professor, the writer, the consultant, stands before us in the full regalia of a devout, Bible-believing, and Spirit-filled New Testament exegete. Practically all of Luther's theology is imbedded in these interpretations in his own, albeit sometimes brusque, always clear and challenging language.

If you can read German (and the editors have tried to make Luther speak a simple language); if you want to draw close to Luther's theology; and if you trust Luther to tell you how to approach the sacred text; then order, read, and make diligent use of this work. A hint: Order at once Luther's exposition of St. John. Luther is, in this writer's opinion, nowhere better than in his interpretation of the Fourth Gospel! Here you will find the quintessence of Luther's theology, his unsurpassable Christology!

We shall permit Dr. Mülhaupt, the editor, to conclude this review:

Wenn ich schliesslich einen Hauptgrund nennen darf, um dessentwillen mir besonders viel daran liegt, dass meine Brüder im Amt und die junge Generation bei Luther in die Schule gehn und bei ihm in der Schule bleiben, dann ist es folgender:

Luther predigt für den einfachen Mann, aber ohne Kanzelton und dennoch aus der Tiefe und Fülle der biblischen Wahrheit, und endlich: er "kann's noch nicht"! (z. B. S. 23 und 90 dieses Bandes). Wie sagt er doch selber!: "Man muss nicht prächtig und kunstreich predigen, dass man sehe, wie gelehrt man sei, und seine Ehre suchen. Man soll sich den Hörern akkommodieren. Das fehlt gemeiniglich allen Predigern; sie predigen so, dass das gemeine Volk gar wenig daraus lernt. . . . Einfältig zu predigen ist eine grosse Kunst" (WA, Tischr. IV, 447; Nr. 4719).

Oberflächlich predigen ist keine Kunst, auch mit geistlichen Gemeinplätzen und unechter Salbung predigen ist keine Kunst, hochtheologisch und für Pfarrkonferenzen und Freizeithörer predigen ist auch noch nicht das Beste. Aber so schlicht und anschaulich und dennoch so aus der Fülle des Evangeliums und so aus ehrlichem menschlichem Herzen predigen wie Luther, das ist eine Kunst. Möchten viele diese Kunst von Luther lernen zum Heil der Tausende, die sich auch heute noch unter unsern Kanzeln das Evangelium auslegen lassen! (From Dr. Mülhaupt's preface to the third volume.)

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION. By James Orr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 224 pages, 6×9. \$3.00.

This is a reprint, but one which attracts the reader by its clear print and fine mechanical equipment. It is an old book, but one which still bears reading. The first book which Dr. Orr mentions in his "Bibliography" is Rothe's *Zur Dogmatik*, 1869; the last, D. M. McIntyre's *The Spirit in the Word*, 1908. The scholars whom the author opposes are such "destructive higher critics" as Wellhausen, Duhm, Stade, Cornill, and others; but wrong views on revelation are still being spread, and the doctrine of Biblical inspiration is still attacked. There are new methods of attack, but much of what James Orr writes still holds. Dr. Orr lived from 1844 to 1913. He was a member of the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, where he sought to promote the union between the United Presbyterians and other free churches. A native of Glasgow, he there served his Church both as pastor and professor of church history. He was personally well known in our country, which he visited repeatedly. Among his books his *Problem of the Old Testament*, *The Virgin Birth*, *The Christian View of God and the World*, *God's Image in Man*, and *The Progress of Dogma* are still popular and are widely read. In *Revelation and Inspiration* he treats such topics as "Revelation and Inspiration in Current Thought," "Naturalistic Schemes of Revelation," "Need of Special Revelation," "Revelation and History," "Prophecy," "The Element of Miracle in Revelation," "Jesus Christ, the Supreme Revealer," "Revelation and Its

Record—Inspiration," "Inspiration—the Scriptural Claims," "Inspiration—Results for the Doctrine of Holy Scripture." For the practical pastor the three last topics are perhaps the most important. Dr. Orr does not hold the doctrine of the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, but believes that there are limitations to inspiration arising from the progressiveness of revelation, the varying degrees of inspiration, and the fragmentariness or other defects of the materials with which inspiration deals (p. 175). His assumption of "degrees of inspiration" is very modern (p. 177). He believes that the sources of information with which inspiration had to deal may have been defective (p. 179). He does not like the expression "verbal inspiration," since that has been taken to mean "mechanical dictation," and he suggests "plenary inspiration" in its place (pp. 209 ff.). Nevertheless he holds that "the most searching inquiry still leaves them [those questioning the divine revelation in the Bible] with a Scripture, supernaturally inspired to be an infallible guide in the great matters for which it was given—the knowledge of the will of God for their salvation in Christ Jesus, instruction in the way of holiness, and the 'hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before times eternal'" (p. 217). And what assures the believing reader that the Bible is the inspired Word of God is the testimony of the Holy Spirit (pp. 201 ff.). He closes his defense of the inspired Bible with the words: "The Bible that embodies this word will retain its distinction as the *Book of Inspiration* till the end of time!"

J. T. MUELLER

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION. By Emil Brunner. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952. 386 pages, 6×9. \$6.00.

When Emil Brunner writes, others read. A theologian does not ignore him, whether he agrees with him or not. Curiosity is an additional incentive when he tells the reader that he has done something which has not been done before. Such is the case in this second volume of his series on dogmatics, in which he undertakes to emphasize the importance of the "I-Thou" truth in philosophy for Christian thought. Hitherto, he says, this has never been done within the sphere of dogmatics. The persistent curiosity on the part of the Athenians to hear something new no doubt encouraged the study of philosophy. In addition, it brought them to Areopagus, where they heard Paul. Some, indeed, mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, but others said, "We will hear thee again of this matter." This is not to compare Brunner to Paul but to suggest that his presentation might induce some readers to hear Paul, particularly regarding the resurrection of the dead. The newness in Brunner's writings may, however, remind the reader also of something less complimentary, namely: a stanza of Nikolaus Selnecker's hymn "Lord Jesus Christ, with us abide, For round us falls the eventide," in which the poet speaks of those who "always set forth something new, devised

to change Thy doctrine true." This applies particularly to those who believe that they must allegorize or demythologize, or whatever it may be, Holy Scripture, in order to make it conform to the prevailing world view.

The fundamental aim of this volume is to present the truth of the personal character of faith as "encounter" with Christ. This, says the author, "means liberation from the rigidity and ethical sterility of orthodoxy and sets us free to have a faith which is based on nothing save the Love of God revealed in Jesus Christ" (p. VI). The author regrets that "the rediscovery of Biblical truth has again, as at the period of the Reformation, led to a rigid fundamentalism and confessionalism, which offers plenty of vulnerable points for rationalistic attacks from the intellectual Left Wing, and makes it appear as though criticism and convinced Christian thought were opposed" (p. V). Accordingly, he here presents the doctrine of creation and redemption in a manner which, he believes, is based on the conviction that sound criticism and genuine Christian thinking are not incompatible. He hopes to remove the difficulties which confront modern man in a strict exposition of all the words of the Old and the New Testament. "The Biblical story of Creation," he says, "is bound up with the picture of the world current in antiquity, which no longer exists for us. The failure to distinguish between a particular world-view and religious truth has made ecclesiastical theology first the enemy, and then the laughing-stock of science" (p. 28). To stop such laughter he proceeds to eliminate those items from the Old Testament which seem most laughable to him and thereupon subjects the New Testament to the same sobering treatment. At this point it might be well to recall that with all due respect for *sound* criticism the preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness. God will permit neither the Jews nor the Greeks to tell Him what to do or how to do it.

The author's criterion for what he considers sound criticism and genuine Christian thinking is, not acceptance of "revealed truth," but "encounter" with the living Christ. He says, "He [Christ] makes Himself known to us through the collective witness of the Apostles, through the story of His life (in the Gospels), and the explanation of this story which the Apostles give us, through which we see Himself, and can ourselves learn to know Him as they saw Him and knew Him" (p. 371). Unfortunately the emphasis is on the word "collective." That fact is significant in the light of the author's theological canon "that in all theological statements about divine revelation we must begin with Jesus Christ as the Word of God Incarnate, and that we are not bound by any Biblical passages taken in isolation, and certainly not by isolated sections of the Old Testament" (p. 52). This canon is further clarified by his description of the witness of the Apostles as that witness which contains both the story of His life and the doctrine of His Person (p. 371). This means that any event in the life of Jesus which is not alluded to by the Apostles in their presentation of doctrine may be ruled out of the canon.

Thus, for example, the Virgin Birth may be ruled out, since "in the preaching of the Apostles, in the preaching of Paul and of John, as well as of the other writers of the New Testament, this idea does not play even a small part—it plays no part at all" (p. 354). The author's theological canon thus applied makes it a most unreliable instrument for measuring the authenticity of any Bible passages taken in isolation. Add to this his conclusion that "the Gospel of John has rightly presented this 'Jesus of History' as the Christ and the Son of God, although it is possible that He never really uttered those words which 'John' put into His mouth," and the criterion becomes still less effective.

In accord with his principle of viewing everything in the light of the living Christ as encountered in the New Testament, the author rejects the Genesis account of the Creation. Thus, basing his cosmogony on the first chapter of the Gospel according to John, he is, at least, certain of two things, namely: that the earth had a beginning and God is its Creator. He immediately casts a shadow of doubt upon this conclusion, however, by discrediting his authority with the suggestion: "It is probable that the Genesis view of the universe was also that of John" (p. 16). But by rejecting the Genesis account, he has conveniently eliminated the problem of the six days of Creation. The reader, however, is dismayed by the author's subjective handling of Scripture.

The justice of this criticism is supported by the author's arbitrary treatment of the New Testament. It seems that anything not repeated as often as, or where, he thinks it should be, is suspect. The Virgin Birth is a case in point. In spite of the clear statements of Matthew and Luke, he asserts: "The historical credibility of this narrative, however, is not such that of itself theological misgivings would be silenced" (p. 355). The rules of textual criticism certainly lend no support to such an assertion. It must, therefore, be based entirely on a theological pre-supposition, without any basis in fact.

The Christ whom the author encounters is conditioned by his canons of historical criticism. This is attested by the pains he takes to explain away the Empty Tomb. Since Luke and John are the ones who speak of it, he feels free to reject their testimony as that of later witnesses and as contradicting Paul. Reading his own exegesis into Paul's glorious chapter on the resurrection of the dead, he concludes: "Resurrection of the body, yes: Resurrection of the *flesh*, no!" (P. 372.) From this the reader apparently is to conclude that also in the case of Jesus there was a resurrection of the body, but not of the flesh, which must then still be in the tomb. The risen Lord indeed assured His disciples on the first Easter Day that they were witnessing more than "the continuity of the individual personality on this side, and on that, of death" of which the author speaks (p. 372), when He said: "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself. Handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see

Me have" (Luke 24:39). Again, according to John 20:20: "He shewed them His hands and His side." But, then, these are the same "later" witnesses who speak of the Empty Tomb! The Christ whom the author visualizes is evidently not entirely the same as He into whose side Thomas could thrust his hand. Textual critics do not reject the passages which relate to the Empty Tomb, but for dogmatical reasons the author does.

This is not the place to discuss the author's hermeneutical principles, though a study of them might prove an interesting experience. Says the author: "When Paul [1 Cor. 9:9] expounds Deut. 25:4 by saying that these are not real 'oxen' but 'apostles,' then we must have the courage to say: at this point Paul is wrong." Really?

In conclusion, let it be remembered that also the so-called orthodox regard faith as encounter with the Living Christ, but they see more of Him through the medium of God's inerrant Word than the author is able to see in a book which to him is replete with myths and unreliable traditions.

L. W. SPITZ

DIVORCE. By John Murray. The Committee on Christian Education, The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. 117 pages, 6×9½. \$2.50.

The material published in this book was first presented in the *Westminster Theological Journal* between 1946 and 1949. When requests came for the presentation of the articles in a book, Dr. John Murray, professor of systematic theology, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, edited and changed his studies in places, but so that the material in this reprint is substantially the same. In his Preface the author describes his approach to the subject and mentions the Scripture passages on which he bases his treatment of the Biblical teaching concerning marriage and divorce. The subject matter is treated in four chapters: "The Old Testament Provision," "The Teaching of Our Lord," "The Teaching of Paul," and "Practical Cases." While the reader may not agree with the author on every point, he will find these studies both wholesome and helpful. Regarding the Old Testament he writes in conclusion that "while divorce was suffered in the Mosaic economy, we have no warrant to suppose that under any circumstances was it sanctioned or approved as the intrinsic right or prerogative of the husband" (p. 15). Perhaps the most important chapter is that which treats the teaching of Christ on marriage and divorce. After a careful exposition of the Gospel passages involved he reaches the conclusion that "our Lord not only provided that a man may divorce his wife for the cause of fornication but that the wife also may divorce her husband for the same offence" (p. 54). With regard to 1 Cor. 7:15 he voices the warning: "If we are to interpret 1 Cor. 7:15 as legitimating dissolution of the bond of marriage, it is most necessary to restrict this liberty to conditions and circumstances which are analogous to those of the situation dealt with by the apostle. It is here that the gross abuse of this particular interpretation must be deplored and condemned"

(p. 78). Of special interest to pastors is the final chapter in the book on "Practical Cases," in which the author, so to speak, tests the principles he has laid down by applying them to specific cases. In view of the spread of the divorce problem also in our congregations we are sure that our pastors will welcome this book in their church libraries. The studies were written not only for ministers but also for laymen.

J. T. MUELLER

DAS LUTHERISCHE BEKENNTNIS IN DER UNION. By Peter Brunner. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1952. 103 pages. Paper. DM 4.80.

This work is primarily a critique of the new Church Order of the Evangelical Church of the Old Prussian Union of February, 1951, and of the new Rhenish Church Order of 1952.

Peter Brunner, Professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Heidelberg, is well known to readers of this periodical as one of Europe's outstanding contemporary Lutheran theologians. His competence to discuss the issue in question in this brochure is heightened by his service from 1936 to 1947 as instructor in Lutheran dogmatics at the Theological School in Wuppertal-Elberfeld and from 1937 on as pastor of the Lutheran Bekenntnisgemeinde in Elberfeld. This appraisal is simultaneously a word of caution and of warning and a plea for patience.

Brunner here writes frankly as a Lutheran for Lutherans, addressing himself to the "nonunited (*nichtunierte*) Lutheran" and the "United-Lutheran" (*uniert-lutherisch*) parishes in the territorial churches comprising the Old Prussian Union. (The former, very few in number, are parishes which, while remaining members of the respective territorial church body, have accepted the Union only in a limited administrative way; the latter, considerably more numerous, are parishes which accepted the Prussian Union in principle, without giving up their specifically Lutheran confessional position. These two classes of parishes stand in distinction to the "United" parishes, which accept as their confessional basis both the Lutheran and the Reformed confessions in so far as they agree with one another, the "United-Reformed" parishes, and the "non-united Reformed" parishes. The latter two correspond to their Lutheran counterparts.) By a careful, penetrating, often word-for-word analysis of the constitutional documents involved, Brunner demonstrates the legal and the historical right of the Lutheran confession to exist within the Union. He is concerned that the Lutherans whom he addresses use every means at their command to prevent either the Union or the respective territorial church to which they belong from becoming more than a "confederatively articulated (*konföderativ gegliederte*) union," in which the admission of Reformed communicants to Lutheran altars takes place at most on a basis of brotherly charity rather than as a canonically secured right.

According to Brunner, the ideal solution to the problem presented by the existence of the various confessions in the Union would be the

achievement of complete harmony on the basis of the Word of God. The next-best solution is what he calls an "ecumenical" one, in which the Lutherans and the Reformed would exist side by side, each group adhering loyally to its own confessions, with the Union restricted to administrative matters. The obstacle to this "ecumenical" solution is the existence of "United" parishes, which actually constitute a third denominational type. The *historic* right of these "United" parishes to exist cannot be denied; that they have no justification in Christian dogma for existence is an insight which cannot be legislated. In these premises, the only tolerable solution is one which faces humbly, penitently, and prayerfully the fact of the confessional differences. The Lutherans must work seriously toward the preferable "ecumenical" interim solution, while standing in conscious commitment to the earnest search for the ultimate, ideal solution.

This is no theoretical discussion of ecclesiastical unification, but an existential document which in an earlier draft form helped demonstrably to influence the course of some of the church events here commented upon.

It has other values as well.

It recapitulates a phase of German Evangelical church history about which American Lutherans generally have heard little and know less.

As a contemporary church-historical document it shows us a German Evangelical Church which is still far from conquering its rationalistic past. It has not yet fully recovered Nicene, let alone confessional Lutheran (or Reformed), orthodoxy. It is possible for a candidate to be ordained in it without confessing unequivocally the articles of the Holy Trinity, the deity of our blessed Lord, and His virgin birth.

Those who have been accustomed to evaluating ecumenical activities in terms of Stygian black and snowy white will find highly instructive the careful distinctions which Brunner makes among the various gradations of "legitimate" forms of ecclesiastical unification: "Regional conjunction" of church bodies with substantially identical confessional positions (like the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany); "reunion" of confessionally identical church bodies which have been administratively disrupted by schism (like the Church of Scotland in 1929); "absorption (*Resumption*)" of one body which changes its historical position by another which does not (like the submission of the Uniate Churches to the Roman Church); "concord" between two bodies with different doctrinal positions, in which each reconsiders its position in the light of the Gospel and finds it possible to adjust its position sufficiently to establish harmony (like the Wittenberg Concord of 1536). In the realm of ecclesiastical association he distinguishes "confederation" of church bodies with admittedly different confessional positions (like the German Evangelical Church Federation of 1922 or the present Evangelical Church in Germany); "ecumenical co-operation" (as in the World Council of Churches); intercommunion; and varying degrees of altar fellowship (full altar fellowship both in the *celebration* of, and in *admission* to, the Holy Communion;

unlimited admission to the Blessed Sacrament; *limited admission* to the Blessed Sacrament under exceptional circumstances). He also differentiates seven different types of church union that exist or have existed in Germany.

Brunner's obvious sympathy for the Old Lutheran (Breslau) Free Church, with which the Synodical Conference is now in communion, is most interesting to an American Lutheran reader.

The reader is tempted to want to ask Professor Brunner a number of questions. For instance, How comprehensive in reality is the "fellowship (*Gemeinschaft*) in the proclamation of the Word of God" which the Evangelical Church of the Old Prussian Union and its member territorial church bodies profess to have? Or, in the light of the corresponding article in the Apology and of the Summary Concept article of the Formula of Concord, is Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, with its "given" unity of the whole Church, quite as applicable to the problem of denominational unification as Professor Brunner would appear to make it? Or, if (as Professor Brunner argues) the creation of a schismatic free church or churches is no solution to the confessional problem posed by the Old Prussian Union, ought there at least not be a constitutional way for a parish which has once voluntarily accepted the Union to recede to a confessionally more independent status, so that, for example, under strong confessional leadership, a "United" parish might become "United-Lutheran" or a "United-Lutheran" parish might become "non-united Lutheran"?

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

GROWING IN CHRIST. AN EXPOSITION OF LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM. By the Catechism Committee of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. St. Louis 18, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House. 296 pages, 5½×8. \$1.50.

In this book appears Synod's answer to the insistent demand for an attractive, illustrated, simplified Catechism for intermediate Grades 4 to 6, written in simple language and providing instructional materials of such nature and arrangement as to encourage the employment of predominantly inductive rather than deductive teaching methods. It is nonabstract, functional. With it appears also a Catechism workbook, bearing the same title and offering "supplementary learning activities designed to encourage ethical evaluation and to personalize the religious instruction."

The content of this new Catechism is well planned and arranged in four major parts, viz.: (1) Luther's enchiridion; (2) an exposition of the six chief parts of the Catechism, with three introductory units on the existence of God, the Triune God, and the Bible; (3) a brief biography of Luther; (4) children's prayers, a list of the books of the Bible, and alternate Bible stories which can be used in addition to, or as substitutes for, the Bible stories used in the expository units.

The manner in which the doctrines of Luther's Small Catechism are

presented promises to simplify and facilitate greatly the work of parents, pupils, and instructors. The uniform order of presentation in each of the 36 instructional units is as follows: (1) The Catechism text for the unit. (2) A Bible story briefly and simply told in a child's language. (3) Pertinent Bible texts with the Bible references. Coming immediately after the Bible story, these texts logically and naturally are to be used not primarily as prooftexts, but as materials for inductive study and teaching. (4) A paragraph or two of Bible teachings drawn from the story and the texts. (5) A series of short questions and answers, averaging about 12 to 15 in number. (6) Word study, or a dictionary of difficult or new words employed in the unit. (7) A hymn stanza of devotional or prayer value. (8) A prayer, simple and quite liturgical. (9) A brief study exercise, usually in one paragraph, titled *What This Means to Me* and designed to bring the Bible doctrine "into relationship to living values and living problems of the learner."

The book merits high rating as an eye-appealing product of the printer's art. It is attractively bound in durable red cloth and richly, helpfully illustrated in colored original line drawings. The print is large enough to be easily read, and the type used is varied enough in size and kind to differentiate clearly the multinatured content of each unit. Unfortunately, the print and illustrations show somewhat through the pages.

In elementary schools of one or two rooms this Catechism can be used side by side with the so-called new synodical Catechism of 1943 or with Schwan's exposition. It will serve to meet a keenly felt need for Saturday and summer, or vacation Bible, schools. The effective manner in which it correlates Bible history and Catechism doctrine suggests the thought that, especially in congregations without elementary schools, it can and will be used to great advantage in the Sunday schools. In many two-year confirmation classes this intermediate Catechism could be used during the first year of instruction, and the regular Catechism during the second year.

Also this intermediate Catechism will not be introduced in congregations and put to the test of use without evoking criticisms and suggestions for improvement. Some individuals may express the fear that the multiplication of Catechisms will lead to confusion in the church as well as in the mind and life of the child. Others may express regret because Luther's wording of the Sabbath Day Commandment does not appear even parenthetically in this Catechism, as it does in the 1943 edition of *Luther's Small Catechism*. Still others will point to possibilities for improvement with regard to emphases in exposition, to illustrations, to questions and answers, to words and phrases, and to like matters. However, inadequacies of this kind may find ample counterbalance in the many excellent features in content and make-up of this book. May the Lord graciously bless its introduction and use in the churches.

A. G. MERKENS

SEX AND RELIGION TODAY. Edited by Simon Doniger. New York: Association Press. 238 pages, 5×7¼. \$3.00.

This is a volume of ten longer or shorter articles examining the relationship between sex and religion. One wonders why, on the one hand, men should speak of sex as a sacrament, as a means of grace and salvation, as a saving power, as an instrument of salvation and redemption, and, on the other hand, make it appear that premarital sex relations are merely a breach of a social code. Has the Sixth Commandment become outmoded? Scripture is referred to and quoted repeatedly, but not as a norm by which men must be guided in daily life. The article on "Christianity and Sex" by Roland H. Bainton, giving an historical overview of marriage and concomitant problems, is in the main quite instructive and stimulating as well as helpful for ready reference.

O. E. SOHN

SOME PREACHERS DO. By Bertie Cole Bays. The Judson Press, Chicago-Philadelphia-Los Angeles. Third edition. 93 pages, 5¼×7¾. \$1.25.

This little book endeavors to acquaint a young aspirant to the Christian ministry with the opportunities and pitfalls of that noble profession and to suggest the proper course to follow. It is written in a humorous way and with so much sarcasm that its effectiveness is greatly reduced. Perhaps this is a case of *de gustibus non est disputandum*, but we could appreciate a more serious approach to the problems of the holy ministry.

O. E. SOHN

RURAL CHURCH ADMINISTRATION. By Rockwell C. Smith. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville. 176 pages, 5 by 7½. \$2.00.

In essence this little volume is an abridged pastoral theology placed against a town-and-country background, but readily adaptable to a city ministry. The author's conservatism often leads him to suggest procedures which are current in our circles, but, among other things, his views and suggestions concerning the nature and administration of the Sacraments are totally inadequate for us. Read with proper discernment, the book offers some very helpful suggestions for effective parish work, especially in the rural areas. The chapters on Parish Worship were particularly provocative.

O. E. SOHN

MORE POWER FOR YOUR CHURCH. By Willard A. Pleuthner. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young. 408 pages, 5½×8¼. \$3.75.

We can best characterize this ambitious volume of 26 chapters as a comprehensive manual of practical church work in which the emphasis is placed on ways and means of developing the congregation's effectiveness. It presents tested plans and projects for increasing a church's power. To mention but a few of the suggested means, the

book discusses such subjects as the enlistment of the laity, every-member surveys, projects for teen-age groups and other organizations, every-member canvass plans, tithing, keeping the church plant and premises attractive, broadcasting, public relations, etc. It is the type of book that is useful to have around for various church undertakings. The author is an energetic layman who has drawn on the experiences of many clergymen and church workers in the compilation of this volume. Stewardship committees or secretaries could find in it a wealth of helpful suggestions, including detailed plans. O. E. SOHN

EXPOSITORY PREACHING FOR TODAY. By Andrew W. Blackwood. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 224 pages, 5½×7¾. \$3.00.

Dr. Blackwood's definition of "expository preaching" is preaching whose "light comes mainly from a Bible passage longer than two or three consecutive verses." Ultimately Dr. Blackwood recommends a sequence of texts from the same book of the Bible. He emphasizes the need for a "unifying truth" for each sermon. In his discussion of varieties of sermon structure, he recommends the method of developing a truth by means of cases from life. In the course of the volume Dr. Blackwood discusses a number of problems related to preaching and parish administration, including the use of the church year, the relation of preaching to the Sunday school and the evening service, and the influence of good preaching on the preacher himself. Dr. Blackwood has written many volumes, and this fine book does more than repeat previous materials and emphases. RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

SUCCESSFUL FUND-RAISING SERMONS. Compiled by Julius King. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company. 274 pages, 8×5½. \$4.00.

No pastor will regret the purchase of this book of thirty-six sermons and addresses by prominent Protestant pastors and laymen on the subject of church finances. This is no endorsement of its over-all theology, which either is Christless or presents a merely human Christ. Only one of the sermons actually dwells to any extent upon the Atonement and uses it as the chief motivation for the practice of Christian stewardship. Though occasionally one also sees genuine Gospel texts quoted, the book presents the social gospel throughout.

But if one is looking for excellent material and direction on efficient and effective ways of preaching Christian stewardship, on preparing for and carrying out the annual canvass, and the like, one will find it in this book. These men are experts who speak from long and wide experience in this field and present the matter so attractively that one does not tire of reading sermon after sermon. With but little effort this material can be given the proper Christian basis and motivation, so that it will prove a powerful aid in promoting Christian stewardship in all its aspects.

O. E. SOHN

w

ry-
as,
nd
pe
gs.
es
is
th

n-
4.

g
e
e
r
f
y
-
o
l
l